DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 887 EA 013 388

TITLE	The Annual Report of the Special Purpose Educational Programs Funded by the Utah School Finance Program. Program Report.
INSTITUTION	Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE	Nov 80
NOTE	144p.; Tables may be marginally legible.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; Career Education; Community Education; Compensatory Education; Developmental Programs; Educational Media; Elementary Secondary Education; Extended School Day; Extended School Year; Gifted; Guidelines; Learning Resources Centers; Music Education; Parenthood Education; *Program Costs; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; School Guidance; Special Education; *State Programs; Summer Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Utah

ABSTRACT

A detailed analysis of Utah's eleven 1979-1980 statewide special purpose educational programs are presented in this report. Each section includes statistical data, program information, evaluation processes, recommendations, and guidelines. The 11 areas covered under this report are bilingual education, career education, community education programs, elementary music, compensatory programs, elementary school guidance, experimental developmental programs, extended year, extended day and summer programs, gifted and talented programs, instructional media centers, and responsible parenthood programs. (JEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A REPORT OF ELEVEN SPECIAL PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION FUNDED BY THE UTAH SCHOOL FINANCE PROGRAM

PROGRAM REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED199887

SPECIAL CATEGORICAL PROGRAMS:

- Bilingual Education
- Career Education
- Community Education
- Compensatory Education
- Elementary Music
- Elementary School Guidance
- Experimental and Developmental
- Extended Year, Extended Day, and Summer
- Gifted and Talented Students
- Instructional Media Centers
- Responsible Parenthood

UTAH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

1979-80

LA 013 388

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. L. Hall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PROGRAM REPORT

The Annual Report of the Special Purpose Educational Programs
Funded by the Utah School Finance Program

UTAH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Walter D. Talbot
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Vaughn L. Hall
Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction

Division of Program Administration
Avard A. Rigby, Administrator

Kenneth P. Lindsay, Coordinator
Ethel-Lee Jensen Schwenke, Editor

Salt Lake City, Utah
November, 1980

JAN 19 1981

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

AND

UTAH STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

BOARD MEMBERS

W. Dean Belnap, Chairman
District 5
Kaysville 84037

Ross B. Denham, Vice Chairman
District 7
Provo 84601

Jesse Anderson
District 4
Ogden 84401

Mrs. Lila B. Bjorklund
District 1
Salt Lake City 84103

Mrs. Joan Burnside
District 2
Magna 84044

Mrs. Erma J. Christensen
District 1
Salt Lake City 84105

A. Glenn Christensen
District 2
Salt Lake City 84120

Rodney L. Dahl
District 3
Sandy 84070

Stephen L. Garrett
District 7
Cedar City 84720

Jay A. Monson
District 4
Logan 84321

Karl Shisler
District 6
Roosevelt 84066

Walter D. Talbot, Executive Officer

LaPreal W. Lublin, Secretary

FOREWORD

The continuous Utah School Finance Program enacted by the 1974 and 1975 State Legislatures provided funds for a number of special programs for the improvement of education in Utah's public schools. This publication contains a report of programs and projects completed in these categorical and special purpose program areas during the 1979-80 school year. It is prepared especially as a report to the 1980 State Legislature but will be useful, also, to other educators and patrons interested in school improvement programs.

Walter D. Talbot
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
Bilingual Education Programs	1
Career Education Programs	13
Community Education Programs	27
Compensatory Education Programs	39
Elementary Music Programs	53
Elementary School Guidance Programs	67
Experimental Developmental Programs	77
Extended Year, Extended Day and Summer Programs	97
Programs for Gifted and Talented Students	107
Instructional Media Centers Programs	125
Responsible Parenthood Programs	133

BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Division of Program Administration
Dr. Avard A. Rigby, Administrator
Dr. Elliot C. Howe, Specialist

I. General Program Information

The State Bilingual Education Program for 1979-80 followed the pattern of the previous years of operation. The amount of funding provided by the 1980 Legislature was increased from $339,279 to $450,000.

The law which provides funding for bilingual education states that the money shall be used for students with bilingual needs. The program is operated and supervised according to "Standards and Guidelines for Bilingual Education" which were originally approved by the Utah State Board of Education, May 19, 1978. Funds are distributed to districts according to the ratio of the number of bilingual students in the district to the total number of such students in the state. Students included in the distribution formula are nonspeakers of English, limited speakers of English, and students who are bilingual in English and another language if they are also behind their classmates one year in reading or language arts as indicated on a standardized test. The English speaking ability of students is to be determined on the basis of teacher or parental opinion cross validated by the student's performance on an objective test. Districts are required to submit a project application, but the funds allocated to them are automatically distri-

buted on the basis of the data compiled and computed by the Division of Education Support Services. Districts are required to submit an evaluation report at the end of the year which describes the achievement and/or growth made by the students in the program. The formulation of a Parental Advisory Committee is also required by each district according to the "Standards and Guidelines." The function of the PAC is to advise the district in matters pertaining to planning, operating, and evaluating the program.

II. Descriptive Characteristics of the Program

During school year 1979-80, twenty-five school districts reported they had students who met the requirements for receiving state Bilingual Education Funds. The amount per student was $62.57 (total State allocation was $450,000 for 7,192 participants). Twenty-two districts accepted the funds and indicated they would take part in the program. Beaver, Piute, and Sevier School Districts indicated by letter that they would not participate because of the limited amount of money they received when weighted against the amount of paper work involved. Elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and senior high schools were involved in the program. The districts continue to place emphasis on teaching English as a second language and on academic improvement. This is due to the fact that more and more non-English speaking students are coming into Utah and because more secondary schools are being included in the program. In secondary schools, the aides are usually directed to help students with academic classwork assignments as well as to help them learn English. Tutors instructing on a one-to-one basis or a teacher working with small groups are the predominant approaches used to teach

English. See the attached charts for additional details of the program (Appendixes A and B).

II. Program Evaluation

There is reasonable evidence to show that the "emergency" or "survival" needs of non-English speaking students of the State are being met. The evaluation reports indicate acceptable growth, e.g., one month's progress for each month in the program as measured by standard tests in reading or language. The number of students involved in the program in 1978-79 was reported to be 2,315. In the school year 1979-80, this number increased to 2,846 or an increase of 531 students. There are more students moving into the State who are limited in English proficiency (LEP). Twelve school districts conduct their programs on a sound and reasonable basis. They state what their objectives are, what they will do to achieve their objectives, and they provide accurate evidence as to the growth their students have achieved. The following districts are commended for the quality of the programs they conduct:

Carbon	Ogden	Tooele
Jordan	Salt Lake City	Uintah
Davis	Provo	Millard
Murray	San Juan	Granite

Some school districts have programs that do not, as yet, demonstrate sufficient clarity in their objectives. Their evaluation reports which describe the growth of the students are indefinite or they do not give sufficient evidence of the growth made by students as compared to the objectives recorded in the application. Districts classified in this category are as follows:

Alpine	Grand	Weber
Box Elder	Logan	Garfield
North Sanpete		

Three districts did not submit final reports:

Duchesne Park City Nebo

An example of objectives which were written with precision and in measurable terms can be found in the "Evaluation Report of the Provo School District:

> Objectives: Seventy-five percent of the ESL students will demonstrate in a school year: 1 1/2 years language growth on the 'Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language' by Elizabeth Carrow (TACL), and/or one level growth on each subtest (below proficiency on the pretest) of the 'Donaldson English Language Proficiency Test' (DELP)...."

The results of the testing program are attached. Evidence has been provided to show clearly what growth the students made during the year. (Please see Appendixes C and D.)

The Murray School District stated one of its goals as follows: "Each student will evidence two years' academic growth in reading English per school year or two months' growth for each month in the program." See Appendix E for the report which indicates the growth their students made during the year.

Districts use a wide variety of testing instruments and there is a broad range of skills that are tested; therefore, it is not feasible to record the test results of all districts on one summary form. Report forms from each district are in the files of the director of bilingual education.

Review visits to local districts generally reflected greater care in language assessment of students, enthusiastic teachers and aides and more attention being given to assist the student to adjust to cultural differences.

In order to provide a more accurate measurement of student growth in English, a choice of two or three scientific tests of English proficiency needs to be used by the districts. Growth made by students could then be more accurately measured. This would give a more reliable index of what is being done for students. There were 2,846 students involved in the program, but 7,192 students in the State were included in the funding formula. The questions that need consideration are:

1. What are we doing for the other 1,346 students who have bilingual needs?
2. How well do they perform in English?
3. Is their ability to use English at such a level that they can perform at full potential in subject matter classes such as science, social studies, and math?
4. How about the qualifications of teachers and aides who work with LEP (limited English Proficiency) students?
5. What type of inservice training program would help teachers and aides become more helpful to LEP students?
6. Should the Utah State Office of Education provide this inservice training?

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

A substantial number of school districts in Utah are more than capable of directing their own affairs in meeting the needs of bilingual students. They should be given the funds and allowed to report what they have accomplished. A few districts should be informed that they must either do a better job in bilingual education, discontinue accepting funds, or return the funds for bilingual programs.

Districts which demonstrate the ability to conduct acceptable programs of bilingual education should be monitored at their request. Districts which have failed to meet the needs of their bilingual students should be given additional assistance and increased monitoring. Additional funding should be provided to meet the needs of students who are not being served. An additional $350,000 to $500,000 should be provided.

Appendix A

STATE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
DATA FROM APPLICATION AND EVALUATION REPORT FY 1980

Miscellaneous Information

Districts	Participants	Total Allocation State Bilingual Funds Given to the District	Cost Per Target Student	Evaluation Report Submitted	Total Amount Used as per Final Report of District
Alpine	42/54	$ 8,820	$122.50 N/R	X	N/R
Beaver*		180			
Box Elder	41/15	7,650	185.58 / 240.00	X	7,650 3,600 D. M.
Carbon	53/51	8,955	169.96 / 175.49	X	8,955 3,245 D. M.
Davis	154/263	44,415	288.40 / 809.00	X	44,415 11,800 D. M.
Duchesne	128 /N/R	5,895	46.05 N/R	NO	
Garfield	4/2	630	158.50 / 315.00	X	630
Grand	9/6	1,575	175.11 / 262.50	X	1,575
Granite	510/510	72,900	142.94 / 141.15	X	71,990
Jordan	302/302	66,330	219.60 N/R	X	65,217
Logan	11/62	5,220	208.80 / 102.98	X	5,220 1,165 Carry Over
Millard	30/57	5,940	198.00 / 178.95	X	5,940
Murray	17/15	2,925	172.05 / 195.00	X	2,925
Nebo	31/	12,015	387.58	NO	
No. Sanpete	N/R/17	1,755	146.25 / 114.19	X	1,755
Ogden	90/100	39,915	443.50 / 399.00	X	39,915
Park City					
Piute*		45			
Provo	105/210	13,635	129.85 / 75.00	X	13,640
Salt Lake	230/307	39,690	172.56 / 203.46	X	39,690 22,778 D.M.
San Juan	763/763	81,765	107.16 / 107.16	X	81,765
Sevier*		180			
Tooele	33/43	5,625	170.46 / 130.81	X	5,625 25,000 D. M.
Uintah	34/31	11,250	330.88 / 362.90	X	11,250
Weber	34/38	12,645	371.91 / 163.87	X	12,645
Totals	2,635/2,846	450,000			434,742.

*Declined funds.

Application/ Evaluation

D.M.=District Money

Appendix B

STATE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM
DATA FROM APPLICATION AND EVALUATION REPORT FY 1980

Parental Involvement

District	PAC Organized? YES/NO	Were Involved in Planning Phase	Operational Phase	Evaluation Phase	Number of Parent Volunteer Workers
Alpine	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Box Elder	N/R	X	X / N/R	X	N/R
Carbon	Yes	X	X	X / X	N/R
Davis	Yes	X / X		X / X	N/R
Duchesne	N/R	X / N/R	N/R	X / N/R	N/R
Garfield	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R	N/R
Grand	N/R	X / X	N/R	N/R	N/R
Granite	No	N/R	X	N/R	N/R
Jordan	Yes	X / X	X / N/R	X	N/R
Logan	No	X	N/R	N/R	N/R
Millard	No	X / X	X / X	X / X	N/R
Murray	No		X	X	N/R
Nebo					
No. Sanpete	No		X		N/R
Ogden	Yes	X / X	X	X / X	N/R
Park City					
Provo	Yes	X			N/R
Salt Lake	Yes	X / N/R	N/R	X / N/R	N/R
San Juan	N/R	X	X	X	N/R
Tooele	Yes	X / X	X / X		N/R
Uintah	N/R	X	X	X	N/R
Weber	N/R		X / X	X	N/R
Totals	7 Yes 5 No 8 N/R	9 / 11	8 / 8	6 / 10	

Application/Evaluation

PROVO SCHOOL DISTRICT - 1979-1980

DETAILS OF STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

SKILL AREA	NAME OF TEST AND SUB-TESTS USED	GRADE	TESTING	NO. OF STUDENTS TESTED	YEAR AND MONTH TESTED	MEAN Age EQUIVALENT SCORE	Age EQUIVALENT DIFFERENCE SCORE	AVERAGE MONTHLY Age GAIN*
English	Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language by Elizabeth Carrow	K	PRE	15	Various**	1 yr. 2 mo	3 yr. 5 mo	6.5 mo.
			POST	15	May 1980	4 yr. 7 mo		
"	"	1	PRE	16	Various**	1 yr. 5 mo	3 yr. 10 mo.	8.4 mo.
			POST	16	May 1980	5 yr. 3 mo		
"	"	2	PRE	10	Various**	1 yr. 6 mo.	3 yr. 4 mo.	8.2 mo.
			POST	10	May 1980	4 yr. 10 mo.		
"	"	3	PRE	11	Various**	1 yr. 9 mo	3 yr. 10 mo.	1 yr. 4 mo.
			POST	11	May 1980	5 yr. 7 mo		
"	"	4	PRE	4	Various**	3 yr. 2 mo	2 yr. 10 mo.	8 mo.
			POST	4	May 1980	6 yrs.		
"	"	5	PRE	4	Various**	2 yr. 4 mo	4 yr. 1 mo	7.5 mo.
			POST	4	May 1980	6 yr. 5 mo		
"	"	6	PRE	7	Various**	1 yr. 5 mo	4 yr. 1 mo	9.2 mo.
			POST	7	May 1980	5 yr. 6 mo		
"	"	7	PRE	9	Various**	10 mo	4 yr.	1 yr. 4 mo.
			POST	9	May 1980	4 yr. 10 mo		
"	"	8	PRE	9	Various**	5 mo	4 yr. 5 mo.	2 yr.
			POST	9	May 1980	4 yr. 10 mo.		
"	"	9	PRE	1	Various**	-0-	6 yr. 2 mo.	1.6 mo.
			POST	1	May 1980	6 yr. 2 mo		
"	"	10	PRE					
			POST					
"	"	11	PRE					
			POST					
"	"	12	PRE					
			POST					

**Depending when student enrolled

*To obtain this score, divide the grade equivalent difference score (column 8) by the number of months elapsing between pre and post testing.

Appendix D

PROVO SCHOOL DISTRICT
1979-1980

THE DONALDSON ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST (DELPT)

Pre Test - Upon entering
Post Test - May 1980

Number of Students Below Proficiency for 1979-80 School Year (K-6)

AUDITORY DISCRIMINATION	LISTENING COMPREHENSION	SPEAKING	BASIC READING SKILLS	SPELLING
17	9	21	17	14

Number of Students Not Achieving A Levels Growth (K-6)

AUDITORY DISCRIMINATION	LISTENING COMPREHENSION	SPEAKING	BASIC READING SKILLS	SPELLING
1	5	8	1	5

Number of Students Achieving Level Growth (K-6)

AUDITORY DISCRIMINATION	LISTENING COMPREHENSION	SPEAKING	BASIC READING SKILLS	SPELLING
5	6	11	3	4

Number of Students Achieving 2 Levels Growth (K-6)

AUDITORY DISCRIMINATION	LISTENING COMPREHENSION	SPEAKING	BASIC READING SKILLS	SPELLING
11	7	2	12	5

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING ONE OR MORE LEVELS GROWTH (K-6)

93%	71%	63%	87%	67%

Murray School District

Standardized Achievement Tests Data
Instructions: Use a separate sheet for each skill or subject area. Attach supportive individual student data - see next sheet.

Skill or Subject Area	Name of Test and Sub-tests Used	Grade	Testing	No. of Students, Both Pre and Post Tested	Month, Day and Year Tested	Mean Grade Equivalent Score	Grade Equivalent Difference Score	Average Monthly GE Gain **
Reading	Wood-Cock							
Reading	" "	K	Pre	1	3/8/80	.7		
			Post	1	5/14/80	1.0	.3	.10
Reading	" "	1	Pre	1	9/20/79	.7		
			Post	1	5/14/80	1.5	.8	.10
Reading	" "	2	Pre	1	9/20/79	.7		
			Post	1	5/14/80	2.9	2.2	.27
Reading	" "	3	Pre	2	9/20/79	2.2		
			Post	2	5/14/80	3.6	2.2	.27
Reading	" "	4	Pre	1	9/20/79	1.4		
			Post	1	5/14/80	3.0	1.6	.20
Reading	" "	5	Pre					
			Post					
Reading	" "	6	Pre					
			Post					
Reading	" "	7	Pre	1	9/20/79	4.1		
			Post	1	5/14/80	7.8	3.7	.57
Reading	" "	8	Pre					
			Post					
Reading	" "	9	Pre	1	9/20/79	6.8		
			Post	1	5/14/80	9.1	2.3	.28
Reading	" "	10	Pre	1	9/20/79	5.2		
			Post	1	5/14/80	7.5	2.3	.28
Reading	" "	11	Pre	1	9/20/79	10.5		
			Post	1	5/14/80	11.8	1.3	.16
Reading	" "	12	Pre	3	9/20/79	7.5		
			Post	3	5/14/80	10.8	3.3	.41

*If the assessment procedure used to select students for inclusion in the 1st grade program did not provide a grade equivalent score, arbitarily assume that these students were at the .7 GE level.
**To obtain this score, divide the grade equivalent difference score (column 8) by the number of months elapsing between pre and post testing.

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Special Projects Administration
Dr. Don K. Richards, Administrator
R. Lynn Jensen, Specialist

I. General Program Information

The 42nd Utah State Legislature created the Career Education Special Purpose Option Program during the Budget Session, January 9-28, 1978. Its predecessor, the Career Development (Dropout Prevention) categorical program which was designated as a career education program for a particular target group, was discontinued by the Legislature in favor of a more broadly based program for career education implementation.

The purpose of the program is to provide local districts with funds to implement and infuse career education throughout the school program and to encourage joint endeavors between school districts and the Utah career-oriented community.

The Utah State Board of Education has taken the position that "career education will be a major thrust of the total public education system from kindergarten through secondary, post-secondary, and adult levels."

The Career Education funds are allocated on the premise that the schools have few responsibilities that are more important than preparing students for participation in the world of work. For the 1979-80 school year, approximately $299,052 was appropriated for the program. The funds are allocated on a formula basis. The local district has the option of

expending their proportionate share of funds for Career Education or for any one or all of the other Special Purpose Optional Programs.

Districts which choose to use Special Purpose Optional Funds for Career Education must "...observe all standards promulgated by the State Board of Education..." for Career Education. The Utah State Board of Education adopted final Standards and Guidelines for Career Education on June 16, 1978. See Appendix A for the Standards and Guidelines.

II. Descriptive Characteristics of the Program

During the 1979-80 school year, twenty-seven of the forty local school districts participated in the Career Education Program. Funds spent for career education were used to:

1. Involve parents in helping students acquire positive work habits and values, and to consider and choose career and educational options consistent with their interests, abilities, opportunities and values.
2. Establish, improve or operate career resource centers that serve students, teachers, and the general public.
3. Conduct in-service institutes for education personnel especially teachers counselors, school administrators and members of local boards designed to help such personnel to understand and acquire competencies in career education.
4. Develop and implement comprehensive career guidance, counseling, placement, and follow-up services.
5. Develop and implement collaborative relationships with all elements of the career-oriented community (business, labor,

industry, professional, and government) including the use of personnel from the community as resource persons in schools and for student experiences in the community.

6. Purchase instructional materials and supplies for career education activities.
7. Develop and implement work experiences for students whose primary purpose is career exploration.

A considerable number of districts used the career program funds during 1979-80 to initiate the Individual Education Plan (IEP) for secondary students. Seventy to eighty percent of the students in grades seven through twelve participated in activities to set career goals and develop educational plans related to their goals. Districts purchased over $30,000 worth of career planning materials for the IEP program.

III. Program Evaluation

The implementation of Career Education in Utah schools has been systematically measured for the past several years. A significant portion of State Assessment, conducted every three years by the Utah State Office of Education has focused on students career development. In addition, a Statewide Career Education Needs Assessment study was completed in 1978 and will be replicated in 1981.

The Career Education Special Purpose Optional Program provides districts with limited but significant resources for moving toward more comprehensive programs of Career Education. Careful planning and implementation of Career Education over a period of years should result in improvements in district and school programs. Given

sufficient resources, the attainment of a comprehensive Career Education Program will insure that students are equipped with good work habits and attitudes, capable of making informed career related choices, and ready for entry into a gainful occupation, further training, or the useful occupation of homemaking.

One of the problems encountered with the career program has been the dearth of programs in rural districts. The State Assessment and the Statewide Career Education Needs Assessment Study have revealed that rural students are significantly less familiar with career options and have fewer career education programs available to them. It appears that the students who are most in need of career education are receiving the least amount of help.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Table 1 shows the allocations and expenditures of Career Education by district.

The Career Education Program received additional impetus this past year when approximately twenty districts received $115,000 in federal funds for career education. The number of districts desiring to participate in Career Education is indicative of the need for the program. The following are recommendations for the program:

1. Funding for the Career Education Program should be continued in order for districts to fully implement a career education program.
2. The Utah State Office of Education should explore ways to encourage rural districts to provide students with a Career Education Program.

3. The Career Education Program should remain as an optional program under the jurisdiction of the school districts and conducted in accordance with the State Office of Education's guidelines.

TABLE I

1979-80 BUDGET - CAREER EDUCATION

District	1979-80 Allocations	1979-80 Expenditures
Alpine	$ 24,441	$ 18,531
Beaver	1,001	14,700
Box Elder	6,913	-
Cache	7,385	6,355
Carbon	4,162	2,004
Daggett	153	-
Davis	33,227	44,999
Duchesne	3,298	2,284
Emery	2,848	-
Garfield	728	1,174
Grand	1,667	1,667
Granite	52,066	63,558
Iron	3,900	-
Jordan	45,328	40,137
Juab	1,016	1,043
Kane	835	835
Millard	2,056	2,158
Morgan	1,142	293
Nebo	11,879	10,928
No. Sanpete	1,570	1,800
No. Summit	655	-
Park City	738	-
Piute	256	529
Rich	425	-
San Juan	2,823	5,908
Sevier	3,269	16,736
So. Sanpete	1,682	-
So. Summit	670	-
Tintic	220	660
Tooele	6,038	6,400
Uintah	4,998	-
Wasatch	1,908	-
Washington	5,617	-
Wayne	429	633
Weber	17,747	17,792
Salt Lake City	20,134	21,553
Ogden	9,870	10,221
Provo	8,605	6,873
Logan	3,258	16,595
Murray	4,090	-
TOTALS	$299,052	$316,366

Descriptor Term: Special Instructional Programs	Descriptor Code:
	Source:
Other Descriptor Terms: Career Education	Cross Reference:

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR CAREER EDUCATION

(Adopted June 16, 1978)

STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

Career education has emerged as a response to a call for educational reform. The principal focus of this reform has centered on improving the interface between education and work. Career education seeks to assist the individual to learn about and prepare to engage in work as a part of her or his way of living. The Utah State Board of Education has defined career education as those parts of the education system focused on providing the individual with the skills, understandings, and values necessary for obtaining and succeeding in gainful occupations in which the individual makes a livelihood, and in the useful occupation of homemaking.

Career education begins in kindergarten and continues through the adult years. Career education extends beyond the school and utilizes the entire community as a resource for career development. In this context, career education is not separate and apart from total life education but is a correlated, integral part of all human development. It calls for a united effort of the school and community to help all individuals become familiar with the values of a work-oriented society; to integrate these values into their lives; and to implement them in such a way that work becomes useful, meaningful and satisfying.

The Utah State Board of Education has taken the position that "career education will be a major thrust of the total public education system from kindergarten through secondary, post-secondary, and adult levels."

If the directive of the board is to be fully implemented and the full potential of career education is to be realized, it is clear that all educators must assume and carry out their appropriate responsibilities related to career education. Particularly, all classroom teachers must infuse career education concepts into their classroom activities.

Efforts in career education over the last eight years have centered on such activities as conceptualizing, developing, field testing and disseminating materials, programs and procedures. In Utah, career education has been moving from an idea toward reality. Recent provisions of categorical funding for career education by the Utah State Legislature and the signing of the Career Education Incentive Act by President Carter indicate that the career education emphasis must now shift from a development stage to an implementation stage.

New [X]	Revised [ ]	Substitute [ ]

Guidelines and standards for the use of the funds appropriated by the Utah State Legislature have been deliberately established to accommodate the diversity found among schools and districts in moving toward a comprehensive program of career education.

Assistance in planning, carrying out, or evaluating career education programs funded by the special purpose optional programs will be provided by the Career Education Unit of the Utah State Board of Education upon request.

AUTHORITY TO SET STANDARDS AND ESTABLISH GUIDELINES

The Utah State Board of Education has constitutional and statutory authority for the "general control and supervision of the public school system." Section 53-2-12 of the Utah Code gives to the Board the:

> . . . authority to adopt policies which have broad application and give to the state board of education general overseeing of the public school system,...The board shall adopt rules and regulations to eliminate and prevent all unnecessary duplication of work or instruction in the school districts and elsewhere as provided by law, and require the governing boards thereof to put the same into operation.

Specifically, with regard to special purpose option programs, Section 53-7-21 Utah Code Annotated 1953 states that when a district "chooses to spend money in a program enumerated in this subsection, it shall observe all standards promulgated by the state board of education for that program."

DEFINITION OF TERMS

(1) Career Education: Those parts of the education system focused on providing the individual with the skills, understandings and values necessary for obtaining and succeeding in gainful occupations in which the individual makes a livelihood, and in the useful occupation of homemaking.

(2) Infusion: The integration of career education concepts into the school curriculum so as to make education as preparation for work both a prominent and permanent goal of all who teach and all who learn.

(3) Career Resource Center: A designated part of a school plant where sources of information on career and educational options and opportunities along with a variety of related media and material are maintained and used. It is the hub of the career guidance, counseling, and placement activities of the school.

(4) Standards: Criteria that are applied uniformly and which must be observed in the operation of a program. Criteria against which the goals, objectives and operation of a program will be evaluated. Following standards is a mandatory action.

(5) Guidelines: Recommendations that describe good practice and suggest procedure which ought to be taken into account in the operation of a specific program. The determination of whether or not to follow guidelines rests with those responsible for the program.

STANDARDS STATEMENT

1. Funds spent for career education shall be used to infuse career education into the school program and to encourage joint endeavors between school districts and the Utah career-oriented community.

2. Programs must meet one or more of the purposes stated under guideline 1 and address one or more of the Utah goals for career education found in Appendix B.

3. Each district shall keep a careful record of the expenditure of funds for career education and report such expenditures to the Utah State Board of Education on forms provided for that purpose.

GUIDELINES STATEMENT

1. Funds spent for career education should be used to:

   a. Develop district and school plans for career education that are based on assessed needs and contain explicit statements concerning specific goals and objectives, scope, sequence, assignment of responsibility and evaluation.

   b. Involve parents in helping students acquire positive work habits and values, and to consider and choose career and educational options consistent with their interests, abilities, opportunities and values.

   c. Establish, improve or operate career resource centers that serve students, teachers and the general public.

   d. Conduct in-service institutes for education personnel, especially teachers, counselors, school administrators and members of local boards, designed to help such personnel to understand and acquire competencies in career education.

   e. Develop and implement comprehensive career guidance, counseling, placement, and follow-up services.

   f. Develop and implement collaborative relationships with all elements of the career-oriented community (business/labor/industry/professional/government) including the use of personnel from the community as resource persons in schools and for student experiences in the community.

   g. Purchase instructional materials and supplies for career education activities.

   h. Develop and implement work experiences for students whose primary purpose is career exploration.

2. Career education programs should:

   a. Generally be directed toward providing career education activities for all students.

b. Be directed toward meeting the state goals and objectives for career education.

c. Recognize the changing work patterns of men and women, and provide for ways to overcome sex stereotyping and assist men and women to broaden their career horizons.

d. Attempt to meet the unique career development needs of handicapped and minority groups.

e. Emphasize the infusion of career education concepts in the classroom as the primary strategy for implementation.

f. Provide support for identifying a career goal as a part of a student's individual plan and appropriate career development experiences such as work or service experience and/or an area of concentration related to the career goal.

HISTORY: The first career education initiative of the Utah State Board of Education was the approval to fund the elementary World of Work Project in 1970. An initial position paper on career education was approved by the Board in 1972, and a career education task force and steering committee were appointed in the same year. A formal organizational unit for career education was established in July of 1974. During the eight years since 1970, significant strides have been made to develop programs and procedures for integrating career education into the school system of the state. Major projects and accomplishments have included the World of Work Project, the Junior High School Career Infusion Project involving eight districts, the Incremental Improvement Project involving seven districts, the Statewide Assessment of Career Education and near completion of a state plan, and the emphasis placed on career education in courses of study, texthook adoptions, accreditation, and the newly adopted graduation requirements.

Efforts to this point have been largely developmental and of a pilot nature. However, both state and federal initiatives in the past have been directed toward a time when schools would implement a broadly based, full-fledged and comprehensive program of career education.

Based on the development of the above mentioned programs and procedures and the impending completion of a state plan for career education, the Utah State Legislature determined that categorical funds should be provided for a more widespread implementation of career education. The predecessor, Career Development (Dropout Prevention) categorical program which was designated as a career education program for a particular target group, was discontinued by the Legislature in favor of a more broadly based program for career education implementation. Consequently, the 42nd Utah State Legislature created the career education special purpose option program during the Budget Session, January 9-28, 1978.

APPENDIX A

1. Substance

Districts using career education special purpose option program funds in accordance with these standards and guidelines should improve their programs for implementing a comprehensive program for career education. Efforts will include but not be limited to training personnel in career education infusion strategies, involving parents with students in the development of work attitudes and work values, purchasing instructional materials and supplies for career education activities, using community resources inside and outside the classroom, and developing improved career guidance, counseling, placement and follow-up services. Programs must comply with the standards established for use of career education special purpose funds.

2. Implications

For the present, the career education special purpose option program will provide districts with limited but significant resources for moving toward more comprehensive programs of career education. Careful planning and implementation of career education over a period of years should result in improvements in district and school programs. Given sufficient resources, the attainment of a comprehensive career education program will insure that students are equipped with good work habits and attitudes; capable of making informed career related choices; and ready for entry into a gainful occupation, further training, or the useful occupation of homemaking.

3. Cost Factors

A beginning has been made by the Utah State Legislature to provide funds to carry out the purposes of this program. While the allocation is small, it should be sufficient to result in some gains in moving toward implementing a comprehensive program of career education. It is deemed likely that future efforts will be made to obtain sufficient funding for full implementation of a comprehensive career education program.

Under the special purpose optional program of the school finance act districts have the option of expending their proportionate share of funds under six categories in any one or all of those programs. Thus through leadership in career education it is possible to parlay considerable funding into career education through persuading districts to utilize available funds to meet career education needs.

Further, career education is a concept which may be embodied into many programs without additional funding. Getting districts to infuse career education into ongoing programs would be a helpful way to move the concept along.

APPENDIX B

GOALS OF CAREER EDUCATION IN UTAH SCHOOLS

I. Understanding Oneself and Relationship with Others

Goal: Individuals will develop a sense of self-worth and a positive attitude toward others.

Sub-Goals

1. Recognize that career selection should be related to individual interests and abilities.
2. Recognize one's own set of values as well as others' values in relation to what or whom.
3. Develop attitudes and personal characteristics necessary in getting, holding, and advancing in a chosen career.
4. Recognize one's own strengths and weaknesses and how others differ from him/her.
5. Understand why community success is dependent upon productive individual workers.
6. Recognize his/her importance as a worthy member of a group.

II. Career Orientation and Information

Goal: Individuals will develop a growing awareness of career opportunities throughout the education program.

Sub-Goals

1. Understand the variety and complexity of careers and career opportunities in the world of work.
2. Determine the basic characteristics and qualifications related to preparation for the performance of the major tasks associated with various careers.
3. Gain an understanding of life-styles associated with occupations in various clusters.
4. Recognize that work has dignity as it contributes to society.

III. Economic and Consumer Awareness

Goal: Each individual will understand the operation of the economic systems in our society and factors related to the national, local and individual economy.

Sub-Goals

1. Develop an understanding of the need for work and the law of supply and demand as applied to the exchange of goods and services.

2. Develop concepts of career potential--the costs of preparing for a career in relationship to expected results.

3. Understand the functions of financial institutions in society.

4. Understand how economic concepts related to income and consumer competencies as related to expenditures affect careers.

5. Understand how productivity affects the economic system.

IV. Career Skill Exploration

Goal: Individuals will acquire a knowledge of the skills necessary to function in selected job roles and career fields.

Sub-Goals

1. Develop an understanding of the materials used and skills associated with business, commercial and industrial activity, production, and be exposed to equipment and materials associated with carrying out these skills.

2. Develop the educational and occupational understanding regarded as basic and important to moving on to the next stage of preparation for and/or entry into the career area of their interests.

3. Understand that an individual may be qualified to perform in many different occupations and any one occupation may accommodate a variety of individuals.

4. Identify particular attitudes and abilities necessary to achieve success in various career clusters.

V. Decision Making and Planning

Goal: Individuals will learn the steps in decision making and how to effectively plan for career development in an informed and responsible way.

Sub-Goals

1. Understand that the decision-making process includes responsible action in identifying possible alternatives, selecting the alternative most consistent with one's values and goals, and in taking the steps necessary to implement the chosen course of action.

2. Become proficient in the process of identifying, gathering, and using resource information as part of the process of making decisions (related to career choice).

VI. Specific Skill Development and Application

Goal: Individuals will develop skills, knowledge, competencies and attitudes necessary for career entry or for next steps such as technical schools, universities, or family life.

VII. Placement, Stability, Advancement

Goal: Individuals will be able to demonstrate the competencies necessary to acquire employment, or move to the next level of training, be successful on the job or in further training, and continue to advance in the career of their choice.

Sub-Goals

1. Understand placement processes including the use of facilitating agencies and be successfully placed in the next step of career development.

2. Develop the basic work habits and attitudes regarded as necessary for entry into and performance in the occupation and career of their choice.

3. Possess attitudes which will allow them to be flexible and capable of taking advantage of advancement or retraining opportunities as they arise.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Program Administration
Dr. Avard A. Rigby, Administrator
Dr. Michael J. Garbett

I. General Program Information

Community education is a philosophical concept calling for an improved partnership between the community and education. It should be a partnership based upon mutual respect, equal status, positive interaction, and a sense of shared accountability. Within the concept, the schools and the community view each other as valuable resources. Through working creatively together, individual and community problems are solved and the education needs of the total community are met.

The concept of community education is composed of two parts:

1. Public involvement in education decision making.
2. Community school as a delivery system of education services.

Public involvement in education decision making is the process of engaging the public in determining the role the school shall play in solving individual and community problems. It is the sharing of responsibility and accountability at all appropriate levels.

The community schools as a delivery system of education services describes a means through which the school, in concert with its community, provides programs and services to meet the needs of the people. It is a school serving the needs of its community from pre-schoolers through senior citizens. Programs and services are offered either at

the school or at other convenient locations through cooperation and coordination with other organizations, agencies and institutions which provide community services. The community school is a visible demonstration of the fact that the schools belong to the people.

Public Involvement Component

All school districts in the State of Utah have structures and mechanisms for involving the public in the education decision making process. In addition to a legally constituted board of education, advisory committees, etc., community schools function to provide avenues for citizens to give input into school policies and operations. Over one third of the school districts in the state have gone a step further in developing a systemwide approach to public involvement. In these districts, organized school-community groups are an integral part of the education planning and decision making process.

To support the efforts of these districts and others, the Community Education Section, Utah State Office of Education, in cooperation with local districts, has developed a training program to inservice the needs of problem solving groups in the areas of group problem solving, group effectiveness and group collaboration.

Funding

State level funding for community education dates back to 1973. In that year, $325,000 was appropriated for community education. Since that time funding has steadily increased to its current level of $858,022.

Funds are allocated to the school districts to ". . . support the concept that the schools belong to the public. . . and to engage the

public in determining the role the school shall play in solving individual and community problems. Each district receives a portion of the total state allotment which is figured on a formula basis.

In addition to State appropriated funds, local districts drawing on other funding sources spend approximately two million dollars on community education and community school programming.

Guidelines and Standards

Each school district in the state is required to keep accurate records of fund expenditures and is required to submit an annual report to the Utah State Office of Education detailing how funds allocated for community education are spent.

Local school districts are encouraged to spend State appropriated funds for:

1. Assessing community needs, interests and concerns.
2. Augmenting the K-12 program through greater utilization of community resources.
3. Involving individuals, groups and institutions in education planning and decision making.
4. Establishing programs and services, utilizing all of the resources of the community to meet the needs of all age groups served by the school.
5. Training educators and lay citizens in the concepts and practices of community education.
6. Developing cooperative agreements with public and private agencies that have interests in common with the schools.

During FY 80 new guidelines and standards were developed to help local

school districts more fully meet the intent of the Utah State Board of Education's position on Community Education.

II. Descriptive Characteristics Of The Program

LEA Projects

During FY 80, several new projects were begun and other on-going projects were continued and enhanced.

Approximately thirty percent of the school districts in Utah participated this past year in a project to highlight exemplary programs and practices which demonstrate a home-school-community partnership in education. Over forty different programs from eighteen school districts were given recognition at the annual Home-School-Community Partnership Conference held in Salt Lake City. A detailed description of these programs appear in a post-conference publication entitled: The Home-School-Community Partnership. . . Some Practical Handles, Vol. II. This publication can be obtained by writing the Utah State Office of Education, Community Education Section.

Three school districts, Granite, Box Elder and Garfield, have launched a long-range project to develop effective strategies and techniques to make the home-school-community partnership a central focus at select school sites. This is being done through the leadership of the Community Education Section staff and the local community education coordinators and directors who work in these districts.

Through this project significant gains have been made in such areas as:

1. Public involvement in education planning and decision making.
2. Community resource utilization.

3. Inter-agency collaboration.

4. Home based education.

During this past year relationships with Utah's community colleges have been greatly strengthened. For example, the Washington County School District and Dixie College have developed a cooperative life long learning project. The College of Eastern Utah and the Carbon School District are embarking on a similar venture.

In addition to these projects, several school districts in Utah continue to develop and refine orderly systems and procedures for involving the public in the education decision making process.

Community School Component

All forty school districts in the state have schools which are designated as community schools, and, as such, offer education programs and activities for people of all ages. There are 411 community schools in the State of Utah, including eight post-secondary institutions which offer programs and services (degree and non-degree) of interest to the general public. Thirty-nine of the districts use funds appropriated by the legislature for community education in addition to other funding sources within the district and from outside sources to support the program.

In 1979-80, approximately 543,000 participants took part in community school sponsored programs and activities. In addition, many community-based groups and organizations used Utah's schools for educational and recreational purposes. This can be seen by referring to table 1.

Evidence that the community school concept is much broader than

opening the buildings for after-school programs can be seen in the increased emphasis being placed throughout the State on the development of collaborative relationships with government and private agencies which have similar goals and purposes in common with education for the purpose of developing a more comprehensive delivery system of educational programs and services.

III. Program Evaluation

Community education as an operational philosophy of education is increasingly being realized for what it is: an approach to education that takes in the total community. Based on various assessments in education i.e., statewide planning commission, five year Goals in the Utah State Board of Education, etc., certain critical issues for the 80's calling for new approaches have surfaced. The community education philosophy will help Utah schools deal with these critical issues as the following chart graphically illustrates.

Concerns of Public Education	Community Education Relevancy	Current Assessment
To build greater public support for education.	Community education seeks to develop public support for education through meaningful public involvement with education.	Systems and procedures being developed in twenty districts.
To capitalize on all of our educational resources.	Community education seeks to utilize all of the resources of the community for education, resulting in a higher quality of education for all without creating a need for additional revenues.	Pilot projects in ten districts.
To avoid waste and duplication.	Community education seeks to achieve greater cooperation and coordination between education and other human service agencies in order to avoid waste and duplication.	Three pilot projects are in place.
To create a climate wherein parents, teachers and students can cooperate and work together.	Community education seeks to develop a home-school-community partnership in education--a team approach.	Exemplary programs in thirty districts
To reinforce the home as the primary educational institution in our society.	Community education seeks to strengthen the home as the primary education institution in society through school outreach programs (parent education resource centers, home-based tutoring, etc.) and by promoting wholesome family centered community school programs and activities.	Outreach programs to the home operational in ten districts. Family oriented community school programs are being implemented.
To meet the expectations of all the public.	Community education seeks to base educational programs on the needs and wants of the people in the community.	Community school programs for people of all ages in all forty school districts.
To assure optimum utilization of facilities.	Community education promotes maximum utilization of public-owned facilities.	School facilities throughout the state are open to people of all ages for educational purposes.
To strengthen the system for school governance.	Community education seeks to strengthen local boards of education through orderly and systematic involvement of the public in the education-decision making process.	Training program in operation involving six districts.

Program Achievements

As the chart indicates community education has made an impact on addressing the critical issues facing education today.

Some of the most significant accomplishments this year are as follows:

1. Identification, sharing and documentation of over forty exemplary public involvement programs/practices occurring within the state.
2. Development of new guidelines, standards and reporting forms which will provide greater assurance that community education funds are being spent in accordance with the intent of the legislature.
3. Successful implementation of a federally funded project in three school districts to demonstrate the impact community education can have on the quality of K-12 education.
4. Successful venture between Dixie College and the Washington County School District to develop a coordinated approach to life long learning.
5. Organization of a statewide planning commission incorporating citizen participation as a major component.
6. Development of media and materials to assist educators and lay citizens in developing understanding and skills to function productively in a school-community partnership.
7. There has been an effort the past several years to more closely ally school volunteerism with community education. These efforts are very supportive of the 5-year goals of the State

Board of Education, specifically in the area of public involvement, implementing individual education plans and utilizing community resources.

Problem Areas

The community education movement is faced with many challenges as we move into the decade of the 80's.

The community education philosophy holds great promise for the future. Implementation of the philosophy is slow in coming about due to the lack of trained leadership. Current funding for community education is not adequate to develop strong leadership at the SEA and LEA levels.

A related problem to the lack of trained leaders is the stereotyped image, shared by many educators and the public in general, that community education is an after-school program mainly for adults. This prevailing misconception makes it difficult to implement the total philosophy.

In terms of community school programming, increased energy costs will make it more difficult for schools to provide no or low cost educational and recreational programs to the people of the community.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on current needs and problems in community education, the following recommendations should be carefully considered:

1. Community Education staff at the Utah State Office of Education should be increased to three full time professionals. The current demands and workload justify this increase.
2. A pooling of information on ways to conserve energy and reduce

energy costs needs to be carried out and effectively disseminated to local school districts.

3. Utah's public schools need to be open to the public for their use throughout the state on a no or low cost basis.
4. State financial support is needed to continue to develop collaborative relationships between schools, colleges and local municipalities. These efforts hold great promise for substantially reducing the cost of government while maintaining quality programs and services for the people of Utah.

TABLE 1

UTAH COMMUNITY EDUCATION STATISTICAL REPORT, 1979-80

District	Personnel							Community Education Training		School Level			People Served	
	Coordinators		Directors		Others									
	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Interns	Yes	No	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High	Groups*	Participants**
Alpine	-	1	12	2	-	-	-	8	-	6	4	5	38	66,310
Beaver	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	14	884
Box Elder	-	1	5	1	6	-	1	12	-	10	2	-	23	34,296
Cache	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	3	3	-	-
Carbon	-	1	5	-	2	-	-	3	8	7	3	3	16	13,505
Daggett	1	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	6	6	6	12	546
Davis	-	1	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	3	7	132	61,244
Duchesne	N/A													
Emery	1	-	4	-	-	-	1	1	5	6	2	2	47	6,948
Garfield	-	1	3	-	-	-	1	4	-	2	4	4	16	-
Grand	1	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	1	1	6	16	1,198
Granite	-	1	5	10	2	2	2	22	-	5	5	8	68	16,573
Iron	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	5	-	1	3	4	29	31,190
Jordan	1	1	10	-	-	-	1	13	-	7	9	5	15	31,440
Juab	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	7	235
Kane	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	3	2	2	2	2	4	830
Millard	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	9	1,320
Morgan	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	1	1	4	1,085
Nebo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25	26,890
North Sanpete	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	6	-	-	1	4	13	7,370
North Summit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Park City	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	202
Piute	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	550
Rich	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	11	264
San Juan	1	-	6	-	-	1	2	4	-	6	5	5	8	545
Sevier	-	1	5	-	-	-	-	6	-	1	2	5	63	20,926
South Sanpete	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	7	1,304
South Summit	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	4	1,332
Tintic	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	4	3	10	598
Tooele	1	-	6	-	5	-	-	6	-	3	1	2	4	710
Uintah	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	2	-	-
Wasatch	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	16	4,459
Washington	1	-	3	-	-	-	1	2	-	1	2	3	4	1,638
Wayne	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	9	221
Weber	-	1	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	4	3	341	30,686
Salt Lake City	-	1	-	1	6	4	3	-	15	2	5	4	43	3,160
Ogden	-	1	3	-	2	-	-	6	-	-	1	4	64	21,542
Provo	1	-	4	2	-	-	-	2	-	2	1	3	-	-
Logan	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	3	1	1	41	27,602
Murray	-	1	12	1	6	-	1	6	-	-	-	-	177	64,966
TOTALS	26	12	139	19	38	7	13	123	34	92	78	108	1,307	482,569

*Groups: There is no set categorization of groups. Ex: Classes, Churches, PTA. **Participation: Attendance at an activity which does not require registration or regular attendance.

UTAH COMMUNITY EDUCATION STATISTICAL REPORT, 1978-79

District	Personnel							Community Education Training		School Level			People Served	
	Coordinators		Directors		Others									
	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Interns	Yes	No	Elementary	Junior High	Senior High	Groups*	Participants**
Alpine	-	1	18	-	-	-	-	7	12	10	5	3	33	60,205
Beaver	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	7	487
Box Elder	-	1	5	-	6	-	-	3	9	10	3	1	23	27,163
Cache	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	43	5,500
Carbon	-	1	6	-	-	-	-	1	6	6	2	3	23	10,301
Daggett	1	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	6	6	6	12	442
Davis	1	-	14	-	-	-	-	10	5	5	3	7	100	15,433
Duchesne	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	4	-	3	-	3	16	742
Emery	1	-	5	-	-	-	1	1	6	4	3	2	42	4,223
Garfield	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	2	2	3	3	3	13	672
Grand	1	-	1	-	5	-	-	-	7	-	2	6	19	1,729
Granite	-	1	4	12	1	1	2	20	-	5	4	7	80	26,950
Iron	-	1	9	-	-	-	-	10	-	5	2	2	11	90,384
Jordan	-	1	11	-	-	-	-	12	-	8	9	5	14	30,083
Juab	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	12	320
Kane	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	2	3	2	2	2	4	766
Millard	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	2	2	11	1,632
Morgan	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	1	-	1	1	5	2,325
Nebo	1	-	1	2	-	-	2	3	3	-	-	5	16	18,473
North Sanpete	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	5	1	1	10	3,425
North Summit	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	475
Park City	1	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	5	13	375
Piute	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	3	250
Rich	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	25	481
San Juan	-	1	5	-	-	1	2	4	5	5	3	3	10	1,620
Sevier	1	-	3	-	1	-	-	2	3	3	1	4	58	18,892
South Sanpete	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	8	-
South Summit	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	1	5	1,221
Tintic	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	11	598
Tooele	1	-	7	-	4	-	-	8	4	3	1	3	4	800
Uintah	1	-	-	2	2	-	-	1	4	-	2	1	251	54,104
Wasatch	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	20	4,773
Washington	-	1	2	-	1	-	1	4	1	-	-	3	12	3,223
Wayne	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	12	273
Weber	-	1	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	4	3	322	23,017
Salt Lake City	-	1	9	1	-	-	3	14	-	3	6	4	43	3,160
Ogden	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	2	19	12,369
Provo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Logan	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	2	2	4	2	2	31	25,546
Murray	-	1	7	3	2	-	1	10	4	4	2	3	166	91,159
TOTALS	25	11	148	22	25	2	19	137	82	110	70	105	1,510	543,030

*Groups: There is no set categorization of groups, Ex: Classes, Churches, PTA. **Participation: Attendance at an activity which does not require registration or regular attendance.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Administration Division
Dr. Avard A. Rigby, Administrator
David Cortez, Specialist

I. General Program Information

Compensatory Education funds are allocated to assist local school districts to better meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged pupils defined as those who achieve far below the level of the average for their age and grade when such failure to achieve is due to economic, social, linguistic, or other similar factors. Most Compensatory Education courses are set up to help in remedial work of school required subjects.

The Utah State Compensatory Education Program was established by the 1973 Utah State Legislature. An allocation of $600,000 was provided for distribution to disadvantaged students in the local districts. The initial legislation earmarked the funds for disadvantaged students and districts received their allocation based on the percentage of the state total of such students residing within their boundaries. All school districts in the state are eligible to participate in the program. The 1974 Legislature made Compensatory Education one of the Special Categorical Programs. Each has an appropriation, but the local districts have the option to spend the funds on one or any combination of the programs. Funds have been available for Compensatory Education as one of the

optional programs each year since that time with funding amounts as follows:

1974 - $600,000	1977 - $ 881,000
1975 - 850,000	1978 - 957,180
1976 - 916,000	1979 - 1,052,808
	1980 - 1,138,984

Funding is based upon the proportionate number of children each district has to the state total in the following categories: foster children, neglected and delinquent children, pupils found in aid to families for dependent children, and children receiving free school lunch. For more detail, see the Utah State Board of Education Standards, Guidelines, and Procedures for Compensatory Education Programs (Appendix A).

II. Descriptive Characteristics of the Program

There were twelve districts which chose the Compensatory Education option in 1979-1980; six projects were centered in reading, three in the area of language arts, five included instruction in mathematics, and one project was centered in Bilingual Education offering English as a Second Language. New educational strategies are periodically implemented to reach this select group of students.

During the 1980 Compensatory Education reporting period, one district indicated that its project was designed for the elementary grades only; two districts reported their projects included both elementary and junior high; four reported their projects included elementary, junior high, and senior high; and four districts reported their projects were limited to junior and senior high (7-12). Approximately 5,011 students enrolled in the program's projects. Approximately 154 persons are employed by the school districts utilizing these funds. The average cost per student served in the program equalled $147.82. The average monthly gain

showed a substantial improvement as in previous years. For specific district data see Table 2.

III. Program Evaluation

According to the data submitted in the evaluation reports, the quality of services given to disadvantaged children is satisfactory. The quality of the project description and the data presented in the evaluation reports is satisfactory. However, it would be of benefit to have each district's Compensatory Education Director conduct a yearly on-site evaluation of his/her own as opposed to teachers submitting statistics and a paperwork evaluation to him.

The methods of evaluation used in the districts are indicated on Table 2. Tests used were: Adult Basic Learning Examinations, Gates-McGinity Reading Comprehension, WRAT (Wide Range Achievement Test), Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, CTBS, and SRA-Reading. The kinds of scores reported were Mean Grade Equivalent, Grade Equivalent Difference, and Average Monthly Gain.

Most districts' period of instruction was from September, 1979, to May, 1980. Tests were also administered in September and May. Only one district tested from April, 1979, to April, 1980. Subject areas of the programs were Reading (Comprehension and Vocabulary), Language Arts, Math, Bilingual Education, i.e., English as a Second Language, and Survival Skills. More specific data concerning each program can be found on Table 2.

Very good gains were made by the children in the majority of the schools. The disadvantaged pupil usually goes through school progressing at a rate of one-half year for one year's experience. The majority of

the children in the State Compensatory Program showed more than a year's gain for a year in the program. The overall average monthly gain was .17 and is strong evidence of the benefits of the Compensatory Program. To obtain this score, divide the grade equivalent difference score (column 8, Table 2) by the number of months elapsing between pre and post testing. A grade equivalent of .11 per month is considered to be good progress for these children. Specific comments made by districts may be found in Appendix B.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Since the program's inception in 1973, the State Compensatory Program has been favorably accepted and used in as many as seventeen districts. The number of districts that set up a program in Compensatory Education fluctuates depending on district needs and desires. The gains achieved by the students this year have been very good as can be seen in Table 2. Apparently, districts are in favor of the option of using the funds in one of five categorical programs as they see fit. There has been no negative reaction to this alternative.

The data indicates that low vocabulary, high interest materials are the most effective for this select group of students. Grouping students according to their level of deficiencies has been found to be most effective for learning. The use of teacher aides to keep instructional ratios down is also desireable.

District objectives for the program remain primarily to have disadvantaged students in the program make approximately one month's growth for each month spent by these students in reading, mathematics, and language arts as established by the districts. The objectives are being

achieved in good measure.

The following recommendations are seen as essential for improvement of the State Compensatory Education Program:

1. The Compensatory Education Program should continue because the funds are used to help meet the special needs of a segment of Utah's educationally disadvantaged students. It should be included as one of the optional programs districts may elect to implement, using the discretionary categorical funds appropriated by the Legislature. A past survey taken by the Projects Administration Unit indicates they like the opportunity to move monies into programs as they see fit.
2. The Compensatory Education program management should remain under the jurisdiction of districts to be carried out in accordance with standards and guidelines of the State Board of Education. A rotating periodical external evaluation should be conducted as mandated by the Utah State Board of Education and SEA program guidance maintained.
3. All districts receiving allocations under this program should carry out careful needs assessments and plan projects with the help of teachers and parents.
4. Districts should implement more thorough and objective methods of evaluation to determine whether critical needs of their disadvantaged students are being adequately met. They should also perform periodic district indepth evaluations so as to profit more extensively from data at program's end. These findings should be used to plan the next year's program.

5. Districts which fail to comply with standards set forth by the Utah State Board of Education should be informed of the areas in which they fail to comply with the guidelines and given assistance. They should provide evidence that they are in compliance afterwards.

TABLE I

UTAH COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM *

FY 1980 and 1981 FUNDS AVAILABLE (WITH WPUs)

BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

No.	District	1979-80 Allocation @$852	1980-81 Allocation @946	WPUs
01	Alpine	$ 57,521	$ 64,328	68.000
02	Beaver	2,774	2,838	3.000
03	Box Elder	20,965	23,650	25.000
*04	Cache	11,416	12,298	13.000
*05	Carbon	16,964	18,920	20.000
06	Daggett	564	946	1.000
*07	Davis	62,873	70,004	74.000
08	Duchesne	10,876	12,298	13.000
09	Emery	6,064	6,622	7.000
10	Garfield	3,732	3,784	4.000
11	Grand	3,682	3,784	4.000
*12	Granite	179,758	198,660	210.000
13	Iron	11,612	13,244	14.000
*14	Jordan	84,478	93,654	99.000
15	Juab	3,928	4,730	5.000
16	Kane	2,358	2,838	3.000
17	Millard	10,287	11,352	12.000
18	Morgan	1,203	946	1.000
*19	Nebo	35,155	38,786	41.000
20	No. Sanpete	6,604	7,568	8.000
21	No. Summit	467	946	1.000
22	Park City	810	946	1.000
*23	Piute	2,676	2,838	3.000
24	Rich	589	946	1.000
*25	San Juan	50,058	55,814	59.000
*26	Sevier	19,124	20,812	22.000
27	So. Sanpete	6,163	6,622	7.000
28	So. Summit	1,965	1,892	2.000
29	Tintic	2,233	2,838	3.000
*30	Tooele	19,690	21,758	23.000
31	Uintah	14,435	16,082	17.000
32	Wasatch	5,131	5,676	6.000
33	Washington	15,737	17,028	18.000
34	Wayne	1,792	1,892	2.000
35	Weber	34,715	38,786	41.000
*36	Salt Lake	168,022	186,362	197.000
37	Ogden	89,044	99,330	105.000
*38	Provo	36,114	39,732	42.000
39	Logan	11,023	12,298	13.000
40	Murray	13,209	15,136	16.000
	TOTALS	$1,025,811	$1,138,984	1204.000

TABLE 2

UTAH STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM, FY 1980-81

District	No. of Student Participants	Cost Per Student	Parental Involvement	Subject Area of Program	Grades	Staff** (Prof. & Non-Prof.)	Average Monthly Gain ****
Cache	106	$ 94.08	Evaluation	Language Arts	7-9	6-NPTP	.22
Davis	263	819.00	Plan/Eval.	Bilingual Educ.	K-12	39-NPTP	NA
Granite	1,120	164.78	Dev/Volunteer	Read./Lang.Arts/ Survival/Counsel.	K-12	9-PTP,15-NPTP 2-NTPP,1-NTNPP	.14
Jordan	485	174.00	Planning	Reading	6-12	7-PTP,3-NTPP	.10
Nebo	104	350.13	Volunteer	Read./Math	8-12	2-PTP,1-NPTP 1-NTNP	.27
Piute	20	133.80	Plan/Dev./Eval.	Reading	7-9	1-PTP	.15
San Juan	763	67.74	Plan/Dev./Eval.	Math/Lang.Arts	K-7	1-PTP,22-NPTP 4-NTPP,5-NTNPP	.05
Sevier	288	36.07	NA	Math	12	3-NPTP	-
Tooele	70	281.28	Planning	Reading/Math	9-12	4-PTP	.11
Salt Lake City	1,586	203.48	School-Home Cont.	Math/Reading	7-12	15.75 2-NTPP,1-NTNPP	.29
Provo	210	75.00	Plan/Volunteer	Listen.Comp./ Speaking/Reading Writing English	K-12	2-PTP,7-NPTP	NA
Carbon -- Data not submitted by district due to Comp. Ed. Director retiring. New director will submit data after this publication.							
TOTALS	5,011					153.75	.17***

*To obtain this score, divide the grade equivalent difference score by the number of months elapsing between pre and post-testing.

**P=Professional, NPTP=Non-Professional Teaching Personnel, NTPP=Non-Teacher Professional Personnel, NTNPP=Non-Teaching Non-Professional Personnel

***Average of only 8 programs.

****To obtain this score, divide the grade equivalent difference score by the number of months elapsing between pre and post testing.

Appendix A

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

STANDARDS, GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Approved December 8, 1975

STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

The Utah State Board of Education included in its list of priorities for 1976-77 Equal Educational Opportunity. "Schools should be searching for ways and means of developing better programs for all students. This will reflect the prime mission of the public schools - that of providing educational opportunity to all children of all of the people". The State Compensatory Program provides funds to assist local districts to meet better the special needs of pupils who are disadvantaged.

AUTHORITY

The Utah Compensatory Education Program was begun by the 1973 Utah State Legislature as a part of the general school finance program. An annual allocation has been approved for programs for disadvantaged pupils since 1973. All school districts in Utah are eligible to participate in the program.

S.B. 383 states, "Each school district shall receive its proportionate share of 1,204 units based upon the number of disadvantaged pupils in such district as compared with the total number of such pupils in all districts."

"(b) Funds expended for Compensatory Education Programs shall be for disadvantaged pupils from low-income families, foster children, neglected and delinquent children and pupils from aid - to dependent children cases."

DEFINITIONS

1. Disadvantaged pupils are those who achieve far below the level of the average for their age and grade when such failure to achieve is due to economic, social, cultural, linguistic or other similar factors. Pupils receiving assistance or enrolled in programs for physically, mentally and/or emotionally handicapped are not included under this definition.

2. Pupils who come from low-income families shall be defined as those who are on the state free lunch count taken in May of each fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the Compensatory Education Program is conducted. This means children reported on full free lunch.

3. Foster children means pupils living in foster homes as listed by the Division of Family Services during the fiscal year preceding the funding year.

4. Aid to dependent children cases means pupils in families receiving aid for dependent children as determined by the Division of Family Services during the fiscal year preceding the funding year.

5. Neglected and Delinquent children shall mean children assigned by the court or admitted voluntary by parents to institutions for neglected and delinquent children within the district as determined by the Federal Title I Survey each fiscal year preceding the funding year.

STANDARDS

1. Districts shall identify by name specific disadvantaged pupils who need special assistance to meet their educational needs. Pupils who are disadvantaged are eligible for special assistance.

2. Programs shall be designed to meet the special needs of the identified disadvantaged pupils.

3. Compensatory education funds shall be used for the direct benefit of the identified disadvantaged pupils as defined above. Funds may not be spent for the general benefit of all students in a school. The funds shall be used to supplement existing programs, not to supplant them.

4. When a school district decides to conduct a project using state compensatory funds, it shall complete a Project Description Form No. SBE-02-1250-02 and send it to the Director of State Compensatory Programs, Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, by October 30 of the school year in which the project is conducted. Project description forms shall be sent to school districts by August 31 of each year.

5. Districts shall submit an evaluation report to the State Board of Education by August 1 following the close of the school year in which the program is conducted. The reports shall identify program strengths and weaknesses and shall reflect program results in terms of the district program. The Utah State Board of Education shall supply report forms for the evaluation.

6. Districts shall develop adequate monitoring and evaluation plans as a part of the program description. Evaluation instruments shall be as comprehensive as possible and related to program goals and objectives.

7. The State Board of Education shall provide external annual evaluation.

GUIDELINES

1. District Free to Proceed at its Discretion. From prior year data which have been supplied by the local district, the State School Office computes the amount of money which a district may have for Compensatory Education. As soon as the local district has been informed as to the amount of funds it will receive, it is free to proceed with its project. The district will determine the amount of allocated funds which it will use in a project. If a district wants technical assistance in any phase of the project, a request can be submitted to the Administrator of the Division of Program Administration.

2. The program designed should be geared to the identified needs of the children.

3. Programs designed for culturally different children should not demean the child's culture.

4. Districts are invited to discuss problems by contacting the Director of Compensatory Education, Division of Program Administration, Utah State Board of Education, 250 East 500 South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.

SBE 02-1250-02
12-8-75 250

August 3, 1979

Appendix B

EVALUATIVE COMMENTS MADE BY DISTRICTS:

DAVIS - "The LEP students serviced in the program were pre and post tested with the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts in English in order to measure their growth in the English language. Their scores showed various degrees of improvement. Some showed a marked improvement as a result of the Intensive ESL Program. The Language Assessment Scale Test (LAS) was also administered to many of these students. Many more needed to be tested, but since the LAS Test must be administered on a one-to-one basis by trained personnel, there was not sufficient time or personnel to reach all of the students. The teachers and principals also evaluated the student's growth in the development of the language. They filled out a monthly evaluation report and sent it to the District office."

GRANITE - "As in previous years, the Granite School District computer and testing program provides the Multicultural Center with a compilation of pre and post testing information concerning the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) administered to all students in the High Intensity Reading Program. At the Junior High level, the Iowa Silent Reading Test or the Nelson Reading Test were administered dependent on the preference of the school. In addition, many of the students in all of the programs were tested with the Language Cultural Test Battery administered by the Center's specialist. The Multicultural Advisors had access to student records to determine the progress which each student was making/not making. The quarterly grade transmittal sheets assisted the Advisors in the evaluation of improved school attendance and reduction of individual absenteeism and tardiness. Unfortunately, all of this data was not compiled before the end of the school year. This will be a top priority for next year."

JORDAN - "The State Compensatory Project testing results (are) evaluated and reported by the District Educational Systems Coordinator for testing and evaluation. The Project Director examines, summarizes, and reports the results of the informal evaluation.
Procedure: All evaluation materials (are) kept on file in the project schools until all evaluation is completed. Evaluation materials (are) evaluated for use during instructional planning sessions, parent conferences and State and District level on-site conferences.
All compiled evaluation forms and evaluation materials (are) sent to the District Educational Systems Coordinator for Testing and Evaluation by May 10, 1980. Evaluation materials (are) analyzed and reports are forwarded by July 31, 1980."

NEBO - "Progress in reading (is) measured by an acceptable standardized reading test administered in a pre-treatment and post-treatment design. Formative evaluation (is) an on-going thing using informal evaluative instruments to gain information to serve as a continuous program gu

PIUTE - Evaluation is done by pre and post testing of student.

SLC - "Students were pre and post-tested with various measures as determined by the schools."

SAN JUAN - Evaluation is done by pre and post testing of students.

SEVIER - "The evaluation of the effectiveness of the program (is) determined by the number of students able to pass the examination after receiving special tutoring by the teacher aides."

TOOELE - "On a standardized basis, the SRA Test Battery was administered on a pre and post-test span in conjunction with the entire school district. The pre-test was administered in April of 1979 and the post-test in April of 1980. In addition, each student takes the SOBAR Test and District Survival Test Battery. By incorporating these test instruments the district is able to closely monitor the progress of each student."

CACHE - "Each child is on a point system (which is an) incentive to progress at their own speed."

PROVO - "Pre and Post tests were given on one or more of the following: (a) Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language, by Elizabeth Carrow (TACL): (b) The Donaldson English Language Proficiency Test (DELPT); (c) English Placement Test for New Horizons in English; (d) Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), and (e) Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS)."

ELEMENTARY MUSIC PROGRAMS

Curriculum And Instruction Division
Dr. LeRoy R. Lindeman, Administrator
Dr. Avery L. Glenn, Specialist

I. General Program Information

The basic purpose of music in Utah's elementary schools should be the aesthetic and musical development of each student. It should also provide an opportunity for the student to explore the human aspects of man's experience.

The results and research findings of the 1978 Utah Statewide Educational Assessment indicate that music achievement (general knowledge of music, music history, and ability to read sheet music) for 5th grade students has risen 9 percent since 1975. According to the Executive Summary Report, "These results are compatible with the introduction and implementation of a statewide elementary music program funded by the State Legislature. This indicates that the program has been effective as the percentage of correct responses moved up from 31 percent to 40 percent".

Conclusions and recommendations based on the results generated from the Utah Statewide Educational Assessment lead to the following recommendations for Utah educators:

1. Review the music activities available to the students with the goal of matching them to specific student interests and needs.

2. Consider specific strategies such as additional pre-service and in-service training, innovative programs, allocation of more instruction time, and greater use of new curriculum guides, to increase the musical achievement of Utah's students.

The intent of the Utah State Legislature in allocating $514,600 for elementary music programs was to upgrade or add to existing music programs. The standards for the management of the funds are contained in the law:

> "The state's contribution of $514,600 for elementary music programs shall be apportioned to each school district in the relationship that its proportionate share of pupils in elementary schools bears to the total number of pupils in all districts for use in developing and maintaining music programs in the elementary schools; provided, no district shall qualify for the funds if it reduces its expenditures for elementary music programs below the level expended the previous school year. If a district does not qualify for funds under this subsection, its proportionate share shall be reapportioned equally among the remaining districts."

The Utah State Office of Education has developed administrative guidelines for most effectively using the funds provided by the legislature. A guidelines summary is included here:

1. Each school district should identify the short and long term needs of its elementary music program and make plans to use

these funds to improve the instruction and learning opportunities for students. The State Music Specialist is available to assist districts upon request.

2. The district music staff or other designated music personnel should be involved in planning expenditures of these funds as identified in guideline #1.
3. Salaries of existing personnel should not be subsidized with these funds, thus leaving money free to finance students' instruction, to employ additional music personnel, and to provide further improvement in accordance with the purpose of the act.
4. It is recommended that these funds be used for instruction and/or in a concentrated or a private type of assistance project, such as:
   a. Exemplary projects.
   b. Developing new programs; i.e., band, orchestra, chorus.
   c. Providing additional elementary music teachers, specialists, or supervisors.
   d. Providing inservice training.
5. Annually, each district should assess the progress of its elementary music program and the effect of these funds on that program.

II. Descriptive Characteristics Of The Program

Money allocated by the State Legislature was distributed according to the procedures designated in the state law. A funding summary is included under Table 1. Districts were sent one-twelfth of their allocation each month.

A sampling of twenty-six of Utah school districts revealed that a great majority of districts in the sample had conducted at least an informal needs assessment in the area of elementary music upon which programming decisions could be based.

An analysis of the major purposes for which elementary music funds were expended is presented in Table 2. These results show the major emphasis of Utah school districts in expending these funds was in the area of developing elementary band, orchestra, or chorus programs. Eighty-one percent of the districts in the sample used funds for this purpose. Seventy-seven percent of the districts reported using funds for textbooks and other instructional materials. The data also indicated that 69 percent of the districts used funds for equipment repair or purchases. Forty-six percent of the districts reported using funds to support existing personnel while only forty-two percent of the districts indicated using funds for employing new elementary teachers, specialists or supervisors. Purposes which were reported less frequently included providing inservice training, innovative projects, and other program improvement activities.

There is an increasing demand by Utah school districts for inservice training and other technical assistance in music to be provided by the State Office of Education. Approximately two-thirds of the districts responding to the special study expressed the need for this type of assistance.

TABLE I
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MUSIC PROGRAM
FY 1980 ALLOCATIONS BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

District	FY 1980 Allocations	District	FY 1980 Allocations
Alpine	$41,390	North Summit	$ 984
Beaver	1,673	Park City	1,308
Box Elder	12,268	Piute	481
Cache	12,740	Rich	664
Carbon	7,347	San Juan	4,713
Daggett	281	Sevier	5,725
Davis	58,087	South Sanpete	2,829
Duchesne	5,430	South Summit	1,164
Emery	5,016	Tintic	453
Garfield	1,338	Tooele	10,381
Grand	3,408	Uintah	8,185
Granite	88,245	Wasatch	3,400
Iron	6,498	Washington	9,456
Jordan	78,672	Wayne	720
Juab	1,777	Weber	31,076
Kane	1,642	Salt Lake	35,274
Millard	3,588	Ogden	16,978
Morgan	2,154	Provo	14,652
Nebo	19,458	Logan	5,326
North Sanpete	2,657	Murray	7,162
	TOTAL	$514,600	

TABLE 2
MAJOR PURPOSES FOR WHICH ELEMENTARY MUSIC FUNDS
WERE USED BY SAMPLE DISTRICTS
(Sample = 26 Districts)

Purpose	Percentage of Districts Using Funds for this Purpose
Developing Elementary Band, Orchestra, or Chorus Programs	81%
Textbooks and Other Instructional Materials	77%
Equipment Repair or Purchases	69%
To Support Exisiting Personnel	46%
Employing New Elementary Music Teachers, specialists, or supervisors	42%
Providing Inservice Training	35%
Innovative Projects, i.e., Curriculum Development, New Instructional Strategies, etc.	31%
Other Program Improvement Activities	4%

III. Program Evaluation

Following are short descriptions of the benefits of the funded programs in the sampled districts:

Beaver District: During 1979-80 the music instructor at Milford High School was assigned part time at Minersville Elementary School. Band was made available to the Beaver and Milford elementary students.

Box Elder District: A junior high school music teacher was assigned as an itinerant teacher to teach skills in playing string instruments to interested pupils. These pupils were brought together late in the year to form an elementary orchestra.

Cache District: Funds were used to hire music specialist to visit the elementary classrooms and teach music skills to the children and teachers. The specialists visited each classroom once a week for a thirty minute instruction period. The specialists used the same books, instruments and equipment available to the teachers. The State course of study was used to develop the curriculum. The advantages of the program were that teachers received inservice training while children received instruction once each week from a specialist. Classroom teachers and district administrators were contacted to evaluate the effectiveness of the instruction to be sure it met the needs of the children.

Daggett District: The 1979-80 elementary music funds were combined with district funds to provide instruction and materials to start an elementary marching band.

Duchesne District: Elementary funds were used to pay the salary of a half-time elementary music specialist for instructing students in the district.

Emery District: Elementary music funds were used to purchase music, instruments, a piano, and to repair instruments.

Garfield District: Elementary music funds were used to provide band in two elementary schools. Funds were also used to purchase three musical instruments.

Granite District: The bulk of the elementary music funds were used for salaries for music specialists. During 1979-80 Granite had seven music specialists, but because funding has not kept pace with salaries, the number has been reduced to six and one-half for the 1980-81 year. Each specialist was assigned to several elementary schools on a two-week rotating schedule and taught a music lesson to every student. Each lesson had three main purposes:

1. To give the student an enjoyable educational experience with music.
2. To implement the district curriculum.
3. To Inservice teachers.

A small amount of money was used for supplies and materials to support the music specialists.

Jordan District: Approximately eighty-eight percent of the music funds went to salaries for five elementary music specialists. These specialists were each assigned to eight schools. They spent their entire day working with the students and teachers. The remaining twelve percent of the money was used for textbooks and supplies, travel, honorariums to hire other specialists for workshops, and secretarial expenses.

Juab District: The 1979-80 elementary funds were used to hire a music specialist to work in the program.

Iron District: The elementary funds were used to develop a music program in a small rural elementary school. Funds also helped provide a music program in a new school.

Logan District: Funds were used to purchase the following new equipment and supplies: autoharps, tone bells, hand drums, harmonicas, and printed music books. Funds were also used to pay a music specialist to work with the elementary string program.

Morgan District: During 1979-80, funds were used, as in the past, for the fifth and sixth grade chorus program, and for the fifth and sixth grade piano program. These funds were also used to buy music and help provide additional staff for small groups in the piano instruction program.

Murray District: Through the Curriculum Council, each school was given the opportunity to apply for inservice or to submit a request for materials for equipment to use in teaching music. A ukulele program was taught in two of the schools, others used flutophones and some recorders. Schools were encouraged to capitalize on teacher talents in helping to provide general music to all students. The balance of the budget was used to provide additional district-owned instruments so students would not be eliminated by not having access to an instrument. There is a high degree of interest in the instrumental program by students and parents.

Nebo District: State funds were used to provide a string program in Springville and Payson, and an elementary band in Goshen, Santaquin and Salem. A music specialist was hired for Lake Shore. Some short-term music aides were hired for use in half of the schools.

Ogden District: The 1979-80 funds were used to expand and improve the elementary music curriculum. The All-City Elementary Honor Choir, Band and Orchestra rehearsal and concert schedule was expanded to two choirs, two bands, and two orchestras, one of each in the north and south ends of the city. A string specialist was hired to teach bass classes, and six quarter-size basses were purchased. Two sets of the new MacMillan series were purchased, and a pilot program taught by the elementary music specialist was started in two schools. Recordings and other materials for classroom used were purchased as enrichment materials. Slide film materials were purchased for use in making a sound film presentation giving an over-all view of the elementary music curriculum. When completed, this will be used as a public relations tool to show at a future Board of Education meeting, Principals' meeting, and to various community groups.

Provo District: Elementary music funds were used to purchase textbooks and other supplementary materials, employ a half-time elementary specialist, employ part-time instructors in elementary band and orchestra, purchase elementary orchestra and band instruments, repair elementary orchestra instruments, and purchase a set of musical dies which can be used in classrooms and workshop publications.

Rich District: Funds were used to purchase new equipment, a filing cabinet for storage of sheet music and records, a recorder, various music books, and instructional aids.

Salt Lake City District: Funds were used to employ two music specialists to continue upgrading the elementary school music program. The specialists served in various capacities throughout the year in all

the schools. Many hours of inservice training and individual instruction were provided by music specialists and other consultants in the areas of music appreciation, classroom instruments, creative movement and singing. The specialists assisted the teachers throughout the district in a wide variety of musical activities, both in consultation and in the classroom modeling or assisting teachers. Some Orff instruments were purchased to assist in teacher training and musical performances. Children's choruses were organized in twenty of the elementary schools by teachers, university students or volunteers. Many performances displaying a wide variety of quality music were presented throughout the year.

Sevier District: Funds were used to purchase new equipment, pianos, textbooks, music books, rhythm band instruments, recorders and records.

South Sanpete District: The state elementary funds, along with district funds, were used to employ a teacher for the instrumental string program in the elementary schools. The teacher traveled to each school.

South Summit District: During 1979-80 state funds were used to equip and develop a sequential musical program from grades one through six. This program included instruction in the knowledge and appreciation of vocal and instrumental music.

Tooele District: The majority of the funds were used to provide materials in the elementary music curriculum. Because of the new emphasis on elementary music, there was a great need to purchase new materials and equipment. Music monies also helped sponsor a piano festival for three days in which elementary students were invited to

spend time listening to piano experts, different kinds of piano music, and in some cases, giving recitals at the festival. These were very worthwhile activities.

Wasatch District: State money provided instrumental instruction to sixth grade students. These students then fed into the regular band program. Most of the money was used for the salary of the instructor, some was used for textbooks, and other curriculum materials.

Washington District: The majority of the 1979-80 state funds were used to place music personnel in more schools, and provide more and better programs. Larger enrollments have caused increased requests for equipment and materials. All new programs require supplies and materials.

Wayne District: The 1979-80 funds were used to employ a half-time teacher in the Loa Elementary School.

IV. Conclusions And Recommendations

The following outcomes are due, to a large extent, to the increased funds received by district music programs:

1. It is evident that the current music textbooks and other instructional materials are now being utilized more by students and classroom teachers than in previous years.
2. Additional emphasis is being placed on music instruction in the elementary schools, and programs have gained the support of parents, principals, and administrators.
3. The development of new elementary band, orchestra and chorus programs is strengthening the junior high/middle school and senior high school instrumental and vocal programs.

4. Elementary classroom teachers are requesting additional assistance from district music supervisory personnel.
5. The Utah State Office of Education is receiving more requests for curriculum guidance in elementary music.
6. The quality of music teaching in the elementary schools has been enhanced by the use of elementary music specialists.
7. Evaluations of student achievement in music indicate positive trends over a three year period.

The following are recommendations for the elementary music programs.

1. Funding for elementary music programs should be continued, and school districts should be encouraged to spend at least the allocation for elementary music on that program. School districts need to upgrade their present music programs and develop new programs geared to increasing the student's knowledge of the fundamentals of music.
2. In order to improve the quality of elementary music programs in Utah, districts need to formally assess music needs and then set both long and short term goals in elementary music in harmony with state guidelines.
3. Management of the program should remain under the jurisdiction of the districts. Some methods of monitoring the program have been developed by the Utah State Office of Education but additional means of evaluation and reporting of program results and expenditure of funds should be explored.
4. Instructional strategies in music should be continually reviewed with the goal of matching strategies with student interests

and capabilities.

5. A variety of specific strategies should be considered to increase the musical achievement of Utah's students. Such strategies would include additional pre-service and in-service training, innovative programs, allocation of more instructional time, and greater use of curriculum guides.
6. Districts should make every effort to use state elementary music funds to enhance music education opportunities for all levels of elementary students. Quality music instruction should not be confined to the upper elementary grades.
7. Districts should make use of the State Courses of Study For Instrumental and Vocal and General Music in developing their elementary music programs.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL GUIDANCE PROGRAMS

Division of Curriculum and Instruction
Dr. LeRoy R. Lindeman, Administrator
Dr. Keith D. Steck, Specialist

I. General Program Information

In 1972, the Utah State Legislature enacted legislation which provided $250,000 in categorical funds to establish Elementary School Guidance Programs in Utah school districts. For the 1979-80 school year, $805,991 was allocated. Each local school district has the option to spend the funds for Elementary Guidance Programs or for one or more of the other Special Purpose Optional Programs.

It was the intent of the State Legislature that guidance services at the elementary level should be expanded and strengthened. This can be accomplished by implementing promising practices that have already been piloted in Utah and elsewhere. There appear to be four major components to a comprehensive guidance system:

1. Direct services to pupils,
2. Guidance assistance for elementary teachers,
3. Counseling services for parents, and
4. Coordination of school and community guidance service resources.

These programs should have a preventative and developmental orientation rather than being remedial and crises oriented. Guidelines have been

prepared with these concepts in mind. Inasmuch as demonstration of effectiveness of Elementary School Guidance Programs remains a top priority over the next few years, it is essential that funds be concentrated in district and well-defined programs rather than extended out over an entire system.

It was the intent of the State Legislature that Elementary Guidance Programs be designed to meet the developmental needs of all pupils in the school where the funds are being used. Remedial and preventive guidance are necessary, but the major thrust was intended to help all students in their growth and development toward becoming fully functioning persons.

A statement of program plans shall be provided to the State Office of Education annually according to the following guidelines:

1. A description of the Elementary Guidance Program will be distinct enough to assure its visibility and should include provisions to evaluate program outcomes.
2. The guidance program should be designed to meet the developmental needs and interests of all pupils in the school(s) to which it applies.
3. Personnel providing counseling services, social work services, and psychological services in the programs must be properly certified by the State Board of Education.
4. Teachers in the elementary school have significant guidance functions to perform. Their role should, however, be carefully delineated and coordinated with those of the pupil personnel specialists.
5. The program should contain the following major components of

a guidance program:

a. Direct services to pupils,

b. Guidance assistance for elementary teachers,

c. Counseling services for parents, and

d. Coordination of school and community guidance services resources.

6. The district is responsible for providing adequate physical facilities to meet program needs.

7. Provisions should be made in the program for in-service training of personnel involved.

8. Funds provided in this program are for the extension of guidance services to elementary school pupils. They may not be used to supplant programs already in existence.

Plans of districts using $15,000 or more under this program should meet all of the foregoing guidelines. Districts using less than $15,000 under this program are expected to meet all of the above guidelines that are reasonable for their situation.

Goals and Objectives

The goal of the Elementary School Guidance Program is <u>to assist in providing an appropriate learning environment for each elementary school pupil</u> that is consistent with his or her own individual needs and interests and which will provide for intellectual growth and facilitate the formulation of a realistic self-concept, the growth of adequate social relationships, and the development of a career awareness that will bring about an understanding of the pupil's own relationship to the world of work. The program should also stimulate the formation of

positive attitudes about self, the school, the peer group, and society in general.

Program Objectives

1. To assist teachers and others to meet the needs of students in intellectual, personal, and social areas and in the development of career awareness. To promote understanding of the individual and encourage adaptation of the program to specific needs, purposes, interests, and maturities.
2. To promote the early identification of individual strengths and talents as well as individual differences that may need special attention.
3. To make the teacher aware of and sensitive to the child's personal needs and goals. To enable the teacher in the classroom to utilize principles from educational psychology, child development, learning theory, and guidance.
4. To stimulate the study and use of guidance techniques by the teacher and the total staff and increase the utilization of personal information, thereby supporting efforts to individualize the educational experiences for each child.
5. To promote the involvement of the school, the home and family, and community agencies and resources in the individualizing and humanizing of the educational process in the elementary schools.
6. To foster acceptance and development of the concept of personalizing education in the total school program.

Learner Objectives

1. To understand the causal and purposive nature of behavior and to use this knowledge in understanding self and others.
2. To increase self-direction, problem solving, and decision-making skills. To understand, plan, make choices, and solve problems in school and in other areas of life.
3. To develop wholesome attitudes, convictions, and concepts about staff and others which results in the "fully functioning person."
4. To develop a sensitivity to the needs of others, resulting in social interest and increasing effectiveness in human relations.
5. To develop and grow in the fundamental tasks of life in the areas of work and social development.
6. To develop career awareness and his or her relationship to the world of work.

II. Descriptive Characteristics of the Program

Each school district receives Elementary Guidance money on a weighted pupil unit basis. For 1979-80, this amount ranged from $800 for Daggett to $145,182 for Granite. Sixteen districts chose to use the Elementary Guidance money in some other program. Eight of those sixteen districts received less than $3,547; the average was $2,503. The other eight districts averaged $8,472 to provide Elementary Guidance Programs. Of the remaining twenty-four districts, fourteen spent more money for Elementary Guidance Programs by using other Special Purpose Optional Program money and/or district money to enhance their Elementary Guidance Programs. Six districts spent part of their Guidance money in Elementary Guidance and part of it in other optional programs, while

four districts spent exactly what was allocated. The larger districts and some smaller ones have Elementary Guidance specialists, but they mostly deal with remedial or crisis situations rather than with developmental programs for all pupils.

The Jordan School District initiated a program in eight elementary schools called the Cluster School Program where a full time Elementary Guidance specialist was assigned. This program placed three self-contained special education units at each of eight elementary schools, twenty-four units in all. These units provide alternatives to the regular school program to meet the needs of handicapped and/or special needs students.

III. Program Evaluation

In evaluating the Elementary Guidance Program in Jordan School District, it was found that: "From the data collected through the questionnaire, it appears that most comments and ratings are more positive in those schools which have full time specialists. The most prevalent criticism of the part time specialists was that they did not have sufficient time to give the services that the school needed." The Jordan report concluded by saying that: "These results would support the full time specialist in the elementary school and would indicate that the specialists' services are valued and needed by the teachers and the principals."

A statement from the year-end report of an elementary counselor in the Murray District illustrates the problem of the part time specialist: "But the point is this: with a caseload drawn from a studentbody of 370 students, and with only ten hours to service them, only a small minority

of the student counseling needs can be met." This counselor is assigned to two schools and he is referring to one of them in the above statement in terms of hours per week he spends in that school.

In the Granite District, there are eighteen Elementary Guidance specialists, and the year-end report of their activities is impressive. All specialists were involved in the following areas: individual counseling, small groups, classroom groups, teacher inservice and consultation, parent groups and counseling, and most of them (thirteen) in special activities. For example, the special activities of one counselor, Althea Bennett, were:

1. Attended five neighborhood meetings in evenings to explain the Elementary Guidance Program,
2. Worked with kindergarten teachers on preschool program for next year's kindergarten students, and
3. Worked with playground supervisors to set up program to control playground problems.

In addition, six Career Awareness Units (Career Week) were held in the Whittier, Farnsworth, West Kearns, Robert Frost, David Gourley, and Libby Edwards Schools. Career Week is a school-wide project which focuses on career awareness through the use of BICEP speakers, classroom activities and discussions, movies, filmstrips, assorted career related contests, and parent speakers.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

These kinds of programs are what we want for all students in all schools in the state of Utah. In order to work toward such a goal, the following recommendations are submitted:

1. One guidance specialist per school for schools having between ten and thirty-nine FTE teachers. This means one guidance specialist for every twenty teachers, approximately.
2. That guidance specialists be responsible to the teachers they work with. Together they will provide an educational program for every student which will lead to each of them developing to his/her potential according to each student's desire and willingness to apply himself/herself.
3. Local school districts be encouraged to focus Elementary Guidance money toward effective elementary developmental guidance programs in one or a few schools, instead of ineffective programs in many schools.
4. Obviously, to provide effective elementary guidance programs with a guidance specialist for each school as Jordan has done in the Cluster School Program, it will require a much larger effort from all funding sources, particularly from the State level.
5. That a minimum allocation of $15,000 be made for each district that does not generate that amount from the weighted pupil average. This would enable those districts to employ an Elementary Guidance specialist to serve in one school if there were ten teachers on the faculty, or all elementary students in the district if there were less than ten teachers in any school.

ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE

1979-1980

School District No.	Name	Allocation	Expenditure	Difference Less	Difference More
01	Alpine	$ 57,791	$ 80,831	$	$ 23,040
02	Beaver	3,104	3,104	----	----
03	Box Elder	20,981	64,579		43,598
04	Cache	19,392	37,933		18,541
05	Carbon	11,232	18,211		6,979
06	Daggett	800	-0-		
07	Davis	92,173	92,173	----	----
08	Duchesne	9,128	6,000	3,128	
09	Emery	7,341	-0-		
10	Garfield	3,164	5,264		2,100
11	Grand	4,666	11,514		6,848
12	Granite	145,182	268,520		123,338
13	Iron	10,219	-0-		
14	Jordan	105,979	466,078		360,099
15	Juab	2,810	-0-		
16	Kane	3,227	-0-		
17	Millard	5,817	5,000	817	
18	Morgan	3,547	-0-		
19	Nebo	28,833	29,403		570
20	No. Sanpete	4,225	3,997	228	
21	No. Summit	1,984	-0-		
22	Park City	2,185	2,185		
23	Piute	1,426	2,626		1,200
24	Rich	1,612	-0-		
25	San Juan	8,235	21,593		13,358
26	Sevier	9,425	-0-		
27	So. Sanpete	5,046	-0-		
28	So. Summit	2,152	-0-		
29	Tintic	1,271	3,763		2,492
30	Tooele	17,360	18,532		1,172
31	Uintah	12,331	-0-		
32	Wasatch	5,126	-0-		
33	Washington	14,610	-0-		
34	Wayne	1,707	-0-		
35	Weber	50,190	50,190		
36	Salt Lake	58,089	28,500	29,589	
37	Ogden	28,933	17,053	11,880	
38	Provo	23,218	195,620		172,402
39	Logan	8,726	-0-		
40	Murray	12,759	9,846	2,913	
	TOTALS	805,991	1,442,515		

EXPERIMENTAL DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS

Program Administration
Dr. Avard A. Rigby, Administrator
Bill E. Cowan, Specialist
Douglas L. Miller, Specialist

I. General Program Information

Experimental and Developmental Programs were initially funded by the Utah State Legislature in 1969 and have continued to be funded each year since that time. The original purpose of the program was to help schools develop imaginative and innovative solutions to their critical educational problems. In order to participate, school districts were required to submit project proposals in competition with other districts. The proposals best meeting the intent of the law and the guidelines established by the State Board of Education were funded for one year.

The 1979 Legislature placed the $324,000 appropriated for the Program under the direction of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to be used for Experimental and Developmental studies at either the state or local district level depending on the criticality and priority rating of the study as determined by the Superintendent. The Superintendent's option has been to reserve the funds for projects initiated by State Education Agency staff members. In practice, however, almost all funds are expended in cooperative efforts between the SEA and school districts.

The 1979 Legislature appropriated an additional $100,000 for Experimental and Developmental Programs, however, this money is to be spent on inservice training activities for teachers and administrators which

promote and teach Economic Education/Free Enterprise System. The modern school curriculum provides numerous and varied opportunities for furthering the economic understanding of students. Social studies, business education, career education, and home economics are only some of the fields which can be enriched with economic themes and overtones and which can be used as vehicles for increasing student understanding of our system.

During the nine years of the Program's existence, a wide variety of projects have been funded and many worthwhile educational outcomes realized.

II. Descriptive Characteristics of the Program

The purposes of Experimental and Developmental program funds are, as follows:

1. Assist the state agency staff in developing imaginative and innovative solutions to critical educational problems.
2. Promote a better understanding of economics in elementary and secondary schools and higher education institutions.
3. Increase the desire and capability of participant educators to teach essential elements of the free enterprise system.

Funds reserved for the staff of the State Office of Education were distributed to projects on a competitive basis. Each SEA staff member was given the opportunity to submit proposals for these funds. More than one half of the remaining funds went to the U-SAIL (Utah System Approach to Individualized Learning) and the Integration of the Arts Project.

The descriptive titles of projects funded during each of the first eight years illustrate the great diversity of subjects. Twenty-two

school districts, two regional service centers, and the higher education institutions have received grants under this authorization.

The projects for each of the first four years together with receiving agency and budget amount are listed following:

YEAR 1979-80

DISTRICT	PROJECT TITLE	GRANT AMOUNT
Utah State Training School	Performing And Dramatic Arts For The Handicapped	$ 10,350
Beaver	Piano Laboratory	7,000
Carbon	Project SKILLS	50,000
Jordan	Automated Management System To Support I.P.	5,000
Provo	Science Interest Of Middle/Secondary Students	3,500
Washington	Fine Tuning	16,394
Jordan	U-SAIL (Utah System Approach To Individualized Learning)	120,000
		$ 212,244

YEAR 1978-79

DISTRICT	PROJECT TITLE	GRANT AMOUNT
Provo	Integrated Arts	$ 40,000
Carbon	Rural Teachers Training	45,000
Sevier	Multi-District Exemplary	34,000
Provo	Field Test of Career Planning Booklet	6,000
Alpine	Free Enterprise Inservice Training of Teachers	3,901
Davis	Free Enterprise	4,600
Duchesne	Free Enterprise	3,500
Granite	Free Enterprise	12,800
Jordan	Free Enterprise	9,200
Nebo	Free Enterprise	4,095
Ogden	Free Enterprise	15,000
Salt Lake	Free Enterprise	11,432
Weber	Free Enterprise	14,150
Northeastern Utah Region	Free Enterprise	4,400
Utah Technical College/Provo	Free Enterprise	12,675
Weber State College	Free Enterprise	2,000
Jordan	U-SAIL	80,000
Weber State	Evaluation Of Teacher Training Program	2,247
		$ 302,753

YEAR 1977-78

DISTRICT	PROJECT TITLE	GRANT AMOUNT
Weber State College	Econ Educ./Free Enterprise	$ 80,000
Weber	Free Enterprise	5,000
Alpine	Free Enterprise	10,000
Salt Lake	Free Enterprise	5,000
Uintah	Math Basic Skills	6,140
USBE	Due Process	22,553
USBE	REWA	2,400
Provo	Integration of Arts	31,000
Alpine	English Basic Skills	3,250
Salt Lake	Free Enterprise	3,000
Salt Lake	Parent Coop. Open Education	7,960
Granite	Free Enterprise	500
Iron	Free Enterprise	500
Jordan	Free Enterprise	500
Provo	Free Enterprise	500
Utah State University	Free Enterprise	2,000
Jordan	U-SAIL	15,000
Jordan	U-SAIL	85,000
		$ 280,303

YEAR 1976-77

DISTRICT	PROJECT TITLE	GRANT AMOUNT
Tooele	Bilingual-Bicultural Early Childhood Program	$ 17,875
Piute	Sequence Math at Piute High	4,764
Weber State College	Infant Education	38,826
Utah State University	Social Study Guides Implementation	31,753
Granite	Bi-cultural and Bi-lingual Curriculum	39,410
Worldwide Research Institute	Improved Management Practices	14,205
Wasatch	Study of Effect of Changing Compulsory Attendance	4,846
Davis	Strengthening Parenting	8,170
Granite	Health Activation	1,587
Granite	Emotionally Handicapped	22,650
USBE	To Study Possibility of Changing Compulsory Age For Attending School in Utah	5,000
		$ 189,086

III. Program Evaluation

The following is a comprehensive description of the free enterprise system based upon the newness of that component in the experimental-developmental program legislation.

Free Enterprise/Economic Education

The teaching and promotion of the free enterprise economic system is becoming an integral part of the Utah educational system. Educational administrators, business leaders, and legislators have been in agreement that the major barrier to economic education in our school system has been a lack of teachers adequately trained in basic economic concepts. State appropriations for teacher training have made it possible for school districts and the State Office of Education to offer programs which increase the economic literacy of teachers and students. It is noteworthy that economic education in Utah begins at the lowest levels of elementary schools and proceeds through all levels of secondary schools and higher education institutions.

Specific programs in economic education vary in a great many ways. School districts differ in the specific approach utilized by teachers and students which enables them to better understand and appreciate the free enterprise system. Similarly, school districts differ in the curriculum level and subject area of free enterprise instruction for meeting the state mandate. The 1979-80 expenditures for free enterprise/economic education reflect this diversity of teaching strategies.

With experimental and developmental funds, more than fifteen school districts were able to carry out teacher training and classroom implementation programs in economic education. There were numerous other school districts which were not directly funded but which had teacher participation through the programs of other districts. Each of the four regional centers were funded and are implementing programs throughout the

several districts which they serve. There was also a double effort in several districts which received direct funding but also had teacher participation in economic education workshops sponsored by neighboring districts, the Utah Council on Economic Education, or various university programs.

Weber School District was granted $9,000 to develop a Scope and Sequence book for grades K-12. The district also held inservice workshops which trained teachers in economic concepts and an appropriate pedagogy for classroom programs in free enterprise education. Weber School District's Scope and Sequence and the inservice training coincide very nicely with their highly successful Free Enterprise Fair. It should be acknowledged that Weber School District has been actively striving to institutionalize economic understanding and free enterprise appreciation for many years. The money which they have been granted is being transformed into a district-wide comprehensive approach to free enterprise/economic education.

Provo School District was granted $9,000 which was contracted to Utah Technical College at Provo. Under the directorship of Dr. Lucille Stoddard, this program provided preservice and inservice education for FLBLA advisors. The program refined previously developed curriculum materials and packaged them in a usable form for FLBLA advisors. This program directly impacts teachers and students at the secondary level.

Davis School District received three separate grants. The first grant for $5,000 was allocated to Paul Mitchell, a secondary social studies teacher. This money was matched by district funds as stipulated by the terms of experimental and developmental programs. Mr. Mitchell enrolled at the University of Utah and completed courses in economics,

curriculum, and educational administration. Mr. Mitchell has now returned to his school district and is presently involved in curriculum development and classroom teaching. The second grant for $1,248 was also allocated to Davis School District for teacher training. This money allowed four teachers to participate in a master's program at Weber State College headed by Dr. Elden Liechty and Dr. Dix Cloward as part of an ongoing program titled "Inservice Economic Education Program for Elementary and Secondary Teachers". The program was a year-long endeavor which afforded advanced economic instruction and pedagogical training to the participants.

A more comprehensive program in free enterprise/economic education was funded by the third grant to Davis School District in the amount of $3,000. This money aided the development of a guide which identified free enterprise concepts for infusion in tenth grand U.S. history classes. The money also aided the infusion of economics and free enterprise concepts in the social studies courses in Davis County schools.

Morgan School District received a small grant of $312. This money allowed Mr. Lewis Brough, an elementary teacher, to participate in the year-long Weber State College project titled "Inservice Economic Education Program For Elementary and Secondary Teachers". This program was a NSF grant award which included thirty-five Utah teachers.

Granite School District received $5,000 which enabled the district to compile and print free enterprise and economic concepts which shall be emphasized in grades seven through twelve. Ten free enterprise/economic education conceptual areas were identified. Each of the conceptual areas were then compiled in five separate teacher activity

guides. These guides cover interdisciplinary as well as subject-matter competencies for courses in business, home economics, mathematics, distributive education, and social studies. Seventy-five secondary teachers from these subject areas received twenty-four hours of inservice training.

Salt Lake City School District was granted $4,000 to help make possible their "Dollars and Sense" program. This approach to free enterprise education is infused in a consumer education curriculum utilizing a competency-based mode of instruction. econdary teachers from a variety of disciplines have been involved in workshops. The district has also maintained a community advisory council which assists in program development.

Wasatch School District received funding for two separate programs, both of which were initiated and directed by personnel outside of the district. Dr. Joyce Winterton of the Home Economics Department at Brigham Young University, with an allocation of $6,000, directed the extremely successful project titled "Free Enterprise Experience for Vocational Youth Organization". Inservice training for secondary vocational teachers resulted in an experience-based free enterprise curriculum. Secondary students, FHA/HERO advisors, and a community advisory committee established free enterprise projects which helped students and teachers acquire a knowledge of economics and a positive attitude concerning the free enterprise system.

Wasatch School District also acted as the funding agent for the Northeastern Utah Education Services. Under the direction of Mr. Kent Ellertson, the regional center was granted $5,851. Elementary and

secondary teachers from nine school districts participated in free enterprise workshops. The project, utilizing Mr. Doug Miller of the State Office of Education, offered a substantial savings from the original program budget. Teachers have received economic and pedagogical instruction related to Kinder-Economy, Mini-Society and the Joint Council on Economic Education materials. The budget changes combined with the special difficulties of serving such a large geographical area have caused the project to overlap into the 1980-81 fiscal year. This two-year project should prove to be an excellent program which will have a lasting effect on students in the districts involved.

Iron School District was funded with $1,000 for a free enterprise inservice training project, however, the actual grant was approved late in the school year and terms of the program will not be completed or assessed until the 1981 fiscal year.

Under the direction of Superintendent Walter D. Talbot, maximum allocations were made to school districts and a minimum of operating expenses were incurred by the State Office of Education. Near the final quarter of FY 1980, it was determined that an additional $6,129 could be allocated to school districts. It was the decision of the free enterprise/economic education specialist to make this money available to non-funded districts which lacked the personnel for program development. Therefore, funding was given to the Central Utah, Southeastern Utah, and Northeastern Utah Service Centers for $2,043 each. To develop teacher preparation materials which will enable a variety of free enterprise curriculum programs. Like the Northeastern Utah Service Center, these programs will not be completed and evaluated until the end of FY 1981.

A large portion of the $100,000 free enterprise allocation has provided for a full-time staff specialist on Economic Education. On July 16, 1979, Mr. Douglas Miller was hired to fill the position of specialist in Free Enterprise/Economic Education. Mr. Miller has had business experience as well as a teaching background. He has a master's degree in Business Economic Education from UCLA and has completed doctoral course work in Economic Education. As a certified trainer of Dr. Marilyn Kourilsky's Mini-Society and Kinder-Economy curriculums, his abilities have greatly assisted in developing a comprehensive statewide program in economics. Mr. Miller has taught numerous workshops and has given training to over 300 teachers during his first year. Each of these 300 teachers have received a minimum of twenty hours of instruction.

Mr. Miller is also Executive Director of the Utah Council on Economic Education which includes educators and members of the business community. The UCEE has put together a comprehensive curriculum and inservice training program which will infuse four separate curriculums at the primary, upper elementary, junior high, and senior high school levels.

There is no doubt that the free enterprise/economic portion of the experimental and developmental program funds have been well spent. The diverse programs have filled the needs of students, teachers, and school districts. Teachers were taught basic economic concepts which they can pass on to their students. School districts are preparing curriculum materials and institutionalizing free enterprise economic education. Hundreds of teachers are developing or implementing programs designed to teach and promote the free enterprise economic system. Economic education in Utah has to be looked at with pride.

Utah is a national leader of economic instruction, but is, nevertheless, still in a developmental stage. If even a slight majority of students are to truly understand and appreciate the economic system known as free enterprise, there is much more to be done. In FY 1980 and FY 1981, there were more free enterprise grant requests from school districts than could be funded. Most of the free enterprise allocations were for amounts less than requested. Not one Utah school district that has a comprehensive free enterprise program completely established in grades K-12 (at least three districts should complete their free enterprise program development by FY 1981). Even with the vast amount of in-service workshops being held, a great many Utah teachers have not received economic instruction. There are still students who have not been offered a basic course in free enterprise economics.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

The following conclusions and recommendations are all inclusive for Experimental-Developmental Programs.

1. It was found that better trained external program auditors and/or evaluators were more successful in their major role of supervision of the development of a viable evaluation plan for each project. The auditors also acted as curriculum consultants, while project directors found problems could be resolved with the help of an EPA. There was little doubt that most of the projects benefited from directives from competent auditors.
2. It appeared that some project directors were badly in need of in-service training to give them the skills to manage their

projects. Lack of evaluative skills and ignorance of the findings of similar projects were two of the deficiencies observed. Project directors are often separated from the expertise needed to perform an adequate job of formative or summative evaluation.

3. It was found that projects which had the help and support of program people had far greater chances of success than those which didn't.
4. The degree of involvement of project directors and superintendents was an important factor in most projects. Superintendent interest and involvement appeared critical to the success of many projects. At times there seemed to be a breakdown in communication between the superintendent and the project when the project was having difficulties.
5. Most efforts to bring about changes in education must involve retraining of teachers. Some of the projects have developed powerful in-service training programs; other projects are not offering anything more than the state universitites are supplying, or could supply if requested. Powerful in-service procedures were those that included:
   a. An emphasis on administrators as well as teachers.
   b. Concern with the practical application of ideas by emphasizing such things as local materials development.
   c. Direct on-site, in-classroom help.
   d. Follow-up visits and "on call" availability for problems.

6. It was found there is sometimes a stereotype notion of state funds that suggests experimental funds are not used to push ideas related to local needs. This notion is incorrect. In many cases, local districts were making heavy financial contributions to their projects, and had every intention of continuing the project at expiration of funding.
7. School districts surveyed showed that state funds provided to projects were augmented by local funds ranging from one thousand to several thousand dollars.
8. The program gave some rural school districts opportunities for improvement of educational programs that otherwise would have been denied.
9. Implementation requires extensive local follow-up and accountability from level to level. It was also found that implementation is not automatic after distribution of materials or dissemination of ideas, but requires on-going coordination and cooperation of administration, teachers, community, and students.
10. Curriculum can be developed and tuilized with parents who have children from ages 0-4 years old.
11. There can be little doubt that Experimental Programs projects are powerful forces for innovation and improvement. The mechanisms by which these occur are sometimes direct, and sometimes indirect. Some examples of these mechanisms are:
    a. The search for information at the local and national level as proposals are developed.
    b. The training accountability that occurs by participation

in the evaluation processes associated with the experimental schools. This aspect cannot be stressed too much. For many districts, the conduct of a project may represent the only rigorous accountability effort to be conducted in a district that year.

c. The feedback that occurs as proposals are critiqued at the local-state level.

d. The visit by on-site evaluation teams as a factor for information dissemination and training. Most of these visits serve to:

(1) Give a district reinforcement for the effective ideas, and

(2) Supply training to staff in the latest curriculum development methods.

The following recommendations are indicated in one or more of the completed projects financed through Experimental and Developmental Program funds.

1. Legislative appropriations for Experimental Programs should continue for the 1980-81 school year. The program initiated by the 1976-77 legislation to provide Economic Education and/or Free Enterprise experiences to administrators in the states should be continued. Adequate planning, implementation and evaluation needs to be conducted to see if the program does make a difference in the schools of the state.
2. Funds should be appropriated for administration and evaluation of the Experimental and Developmental programs.

3. Leaders of the Experimental Programs project in the Utah State Office of Education should continue to improve leadership, management, and follow-up services to project participants through:

   a. Better use of external evaluators and program auditors.
   b. Better involvement of personnel from higher-learning institutions in projects.
   c. Better communication with district superintendents regarding projects in their districts.
   d. Better evaluation, reporting, and disseminating of projects and project fundings.
   e. Better information provided to educators, school patrons, legislators, and others so that better decisions can be made for the improvement of public education in Utah.

APPROVAL PROCESS FOR FUNDING MINERAL LEASE AND EXPERIMENTAL-DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS

Utah State Law[1/] and Utah State Board of Education Standards and Guidelines[2/] provide a framework for administering Mineral Lease and Experimental-Developmental Program funds appropriated to the Utah State Board of Education. However, no specific process for evaluating applications and awarding project grants was included.

It is the purpose of this document to establish an approval process for funding mineral lease and experimental-developmental projects.

APPROVAL PROCESS

A. Eligible Applicants.

1. 70% of the Mineral Lease and Experimental-Developmental funds appropriated to the State Board of Education, less those funds allocated to the Free Enterprise/Economic Education Project, will be reserved for State Education Agency staff-initiated developmental projects.[3/] When appropriate, selected SEA staff members will be transferred to Special Projects Administration during the time required to develop such projects.

2. 30% of these funds will be reserved for unsolicited projects of merit, regardless of the source of initiation, if they are endorsed, advocated and supported by SEA personnel, and they are in line with State Board of Education priorities.

B. Processing of Proposals.

1. Applications will be received by the Dissemination and Educational Development Section, Division of Program Administration.

2. Applications will be logged into a master file of project applications maintained by the Dissemination and Educational Development Section.

3. All project applications will be read and evaluated by selected SEA staff and, if deemed desirable or necessary, by readers from outside the SEA who have expertise in the content area of the application.

   The readers' evaluations will be based on these criteria:

   (a) the value of the proposed research,

(b) the probability of success of the project,

(c) the cost of the project in relation to anticipated outcomes,

(d) State Board priorities,

(e) uniqueness of the project,

(f) appropriateness of the design of the project to the solution of the problem, and

(g) potential for statewide impact.

4. A negotiation session involving those applicants whose projects are recommended for funding and staff of the Dissemination and Educational Development Section will be conducted to clarify issues raised by the readers, to adjust budgets, and to effect desired modifications in the proposal.

5. The application in final negotiated form, together with reader ratings, comments and recommendations, will be presented to an SEA Review Panel consisting of the two Associate Superintendents and the Administrators of the Division of Program Administration and Special Projects for final review and decision.

6. Grant award documents will be prepared for those applications approved by the SEA Review Panel and placed on the Management Team consent calendar.

7. When approved by the Management Team the grant award documents will be signed by the Administrator, Division of Program Administration.

8. Reimbursement payments will be processed by staff of the Dissemination and Educational Development Section within established fiscal guidelines.

1/ Sub-section 65-1-64.5, Utah Code Annotated.

2/ Utah State Board of Education Policies and Procedures Manual, CGL-1, page 3643.

3/ A developmental project is defined as a significant, practical unit of activity having educational value which addresses an identified major issue or problem in education, and which involves investigation and solution of problems.

EXTENDED YEAR, EXTENDED DAY AND SUMMER PROGRAMS

Division of Program Administration
Dr. Avard A. Rigby, Administrator
Kay M. Haws, Specialist

I. General Program Information

In 1965, the Utah Legislature established and funded the Extended Year, Day and Summer Program to provide for:

1. Extending instructional offerings and summer school opportunities to students.
2. Making it possible for local school districts to employ selected teachers to work with students and to engage in other instructional improvement activities.

The Legislature amended the program in 1970, adding two new interrelated concepts known as the Extended Day Program and the Community School Program. The law stipulated that a minimum of $200,000 of the total of $800,000 appropriated was to be expended for Community School Programs.

In 1971, the Legislature separated the Extended Year/Day and Summer Programs and the Community School Programs. Separate funding was established for each of the two programs.

In 1974 Legislature funded these two programs and four others categorically but gave each local school district the option of spending its funds from the six programs in one or more of the six programs. It was required at the same time, however, that the programs operating

in a district would need to follow standards for each program as approved by the State Board of Education.

In 1980, the program was funded at $969,650. The funds were allocated to school districts on the basis of the ratio that each school district's distribution units relate to the distribution units of all school districts.

In the State Board approved Guidelines for the Extended Year/Day and Summer Programs the objectives of this Program are described as follows:

> Direct teaching-learning situations for students may be accomplished by providing activities for students which will extend learning opportunities and meet the needs of youngsters not met during the regular school year or school day. Such activities could include: regular courses, enrichment courses, make-up work, remedial and special education classes, advanced or accelerated classes, cooperative or diversified vocational education programs, field trips, summer camps, informal laboratory experiences, research opportunities, and a variety of activities calculated to provide opportunities for exploration and experimentation as well as depth and breadth in course work and special interest projects.
>
> Summer activities for teachers, other than those in programs involving students, could include: preparing special materials for instruction; developing new and innovative approaches to learning; preparing curriculum materials, surveying new instructional materials and equipment; reviewing evaluative procedures, selecting textbooks and other materials; preparing tapes and other audiovisual materials; gaining new insights into how children learn and mature; and participating in district sponsored inservice training programs in fields related to teaching assignments. Teacher may be employed in curriculum development and inservice training projects during the summer months or on an extended day basis.

In keeping with the guidelines adopted for the Program, district offerings centered around three major activities:

1. Direct teaching instruction of students.
2. Curriculum development efforts.
3. Inservice training for teachers.

II. Descriptive Characteristics of Program

During 1979-80, thirty-seven districts participated in the Program enrolling a total of 51,734 students (23,227 secondary and 28,397 elementary). In addition, a partial report indicates that twenty-seven elementary and secondary programs of teacher inservice training and curriculum development were conducted.

A change in data collection procedures will result in greater program accountability for 1980-81 including data on all three major areas of fund expenditures:

1. Hours of direct instruction by elementary and secondary level.
2. Hours of teacher inservice training.
3. Hours used in curricula development.

The initial intent of the legislation was to give districts flexibility in the use of these funds. The programs reflected the broad variety of local needs and interests, and were primarily remedial in nature. Now they vary from basic group and individual remedial instruction, to advanced and innovative areas of instruction, and total school building staff inservice training. Remedial courses have reflected such specific accomplishments as two grade point increases in reading (Uintah School District) to enthusiastic learning in ecology

and survival training (Weber School District).

III. Program Evaluation

The flexibility needed by educators to meet varied educational needs can be met in part by the Extended Year/Day and Summer Program. The trend away from traditional remedial courses continues. Districts have found that these programs continued to:

1. Provide opportunities to develop articulation of curricula
2. Provide a special occasion for desired curriculum improvement.
3. Provide an opportunity for special planning for the regular school year.
4. Enhance community involvement in the school program resulting in strong parent support.

Strengths of the program include:

1. Individualization of both remedial and advanced instruction.
2. Lack of step-block time pressures.
3. Increased student and community input as to content and scheduling of services.
4. Voluntary participation and new approaches to learning.

Weaknesses of the program were:

1. Insufficient funds to meet requested services.
2. Continuation of previous programs without adequate review of priority needs and consideration of changing times. Often music and athletic activities from previous years were continued without an open review of total needs.

Testimonials of a parent/child tutoring class have been added as examples of an innovative program that strengthens the partnership of

home, school, and student by using common coals and accomplishments, professional educational competencies, and increased student and parent skills. (See Appendixes A and B.)

The Extended Program provides districts the opportunity to meet local educational needs in unique ways during after school hours, weekends, and summers. Summer programs offer an opportunity for outdoor activities. Other Community resources should be used to improve and implement the best possible program.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The Extended Year, Extended Day and Summer School Programs should continue as supplementary enrichment programs for students in public schools and should be included as one of the optional programs districts may elect to implement utilizing funds appropriated to them by the Legislature for categorical programs.
2. Program management should continue under jurisdiction of the districts and to be carried out in accordance with the State Education Agency guidelines.
3. Program data is needed for program accountability and should be available in the revised 1980-81 Form S-3 Report.
4. The local planning, program selection, and funding of activities should reflect selected, prioritized district goals and objectives.
5. Maximum parent, student, and community participation in the planning and implementation of the Extended Program should be encouraged to enhance their partnership and student learning.

6. Program accomplishments should be evaluated against criterial needs and benefits for students.

APPENDIX A

Ann M. Miller
575 Ogden Canyon
Ogden, Utah 84401

August 28, 1980

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in regards to a class I taught this past summer in parent tutoring skills. During This class, the parents attended with their children. Children from kindergarten to ninth grade were invited.

This class was one of the most positive teaching experiences in my teaching career. The parents started out unsure of what to expect and the students were reluctant to attend summer school. After a couple of sessions, both parents and children were enthusiastic about the class.

An extremely important focus of this class was to have parents and children working together as a team on a problem. This was important in order to increase communication on a positive basis about academic skills. The parents were given methods of using positive reinforcement along with a chance to practice these methods. The class was organized so that a short lecture session was followed by activities which involved parents and children working together to practice what had been covered in the lecture.

A wide range of topics was covered in the class including: precision teaching techniques useful in reinforcing both math and reading; task analysis skills; library and reference materials skilla; question asking skills using Bloom's taxonomy to encourage higher levels of thinking; methods of motivating children; and the basic skills of math and reading. The parents were taught how to incorporate these skills into their daily life experiences with their children. After all, parents are the key to teaching the practicality of learning subjects like math by showing their children how they are used in the world.

A teacher's positive feeling about a class is always shared by the people involved in the class. Following are some of the ideas that parents shared with me about the class.

Mrs. Giedt enrolled herself and her son Todd in the class because they both extremely discouraged after three years of Todd failing in math. She felt encouragement from the beginning. The precision teaching materials gave her something concrete to work with Todd in math. When Todd was not progressing with the initial materials, she was shown how to use task analysis in choosing other materials to help bridge the gap. Perceptual training was used in helping Todd which Mrs. Giedt found

very useful. When she discovered that the teaching was primarily through experiences rather than strictly rote learning, she brought her two other children since she felt that they were being cheated by being left home. She would like to continue in a program of this type to maintain the progress that she and Todd have made.

When Mrs. Poole started the class, she expected her daughter, Nova, to be tutored by someone else rather than doing it herself. She was reluctant to continue the class beyond the first night because she and Nova became short-tempered with each other whenever Mrs. Poole helped Nova with her homework. Mrs. Poole finished the class, becoming much more patient with Nova. She felt that both she and Nova had gained confidence from the class along with greater understanding.

Mrs. Bangerter brought her preschool son, Todd, to the class to find some ways to help Todd get ready for kindergarten. She did not have any other children so she was concerned that she was teaching the right things to him at home to prepare him for school. She found the skills taught in class very helpful. She also enjoyed being exposed to all the new ideas. She expecially felt that the structured assignments both during class and at home gave her and Todd a chance to interactact. Without the class, this interaction might not have occured.

These are just three examples of comments and feelings of parents about the class. The overall attitude of the adults and children in the class was extremely positive. It was a pleasure and a challenge to teach. I enjoyed adding this class to my educational experiences.

Sincerely yours,

Ann M. Miller

Ann M. Miller

APPENDIX B

The parent tutoring class was informative, useful, practical and fun.

It was informative because it gave the parents insights into the learning difficulties children can have. The "Peanut Butter and Jam Sandwich" demonstration showed the importance of giving clear instructions.

The class was useful because the ideas presented told the parents specifically how to help and were easy for both student and parent. An example is the polyfilm and grease pencil for taking tests of math facts. Students found this a novel and fun way to learn. For parents it solved the problem of having many copies made.

The class was practical because all the ideas presented were relevant to the problems children can have. Teaching the parents to chart their children's progress gave the students instant feedback on their progress. The discussion on finding reading material that caters to the child's interests was particularly informative. There was also a library tour and various exercises to teach children and parents how to use the library. Making fudge from a metric recipe was a practical and fun application of metric facts.

The class was fun because of subject matter, variety of activities and teaching quality.

Linda M. Day

PROGRAMS FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS

Special Projects Administration
Dr. Don K. Richards, Administrator
Jewel J. Bindrup, Specialist

I. General Program Information

The Program for Gifted and Talented Students was funded initially by the 1976 State Legislature. The continuing purpose is "to provide programs for students who are gifted and talented under definitions and guidelines developed by the State Board of Education." In order to participate, school districts are required to submit project proposals in competition with other districts. Proposals best meeting the intent of the law and the guidelines are funded for one year. An overriding goal is to encourage, expand, and improve programs for gifted and talented students in schools and communities to the end that such programs will be responsive to the needs of individual students.

The 1976 Legislature placed the $137,000 appropriated for the program under the direction of the State Board of Education. An advisory committee recommends funding for projects which deal with the multiple types of talents identified in the definition of gifted and talented students. Legislative funding for 1977 was $317,150; for 1978 it was $480,000; for 1979 it was $514,600, and for 1980, $571,206. Distribution of the funds for all four years is shown under Table 1.

TABLE 1

GIFTED/TALENTED FUNDING

	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81
Alpine	$	$20,000	$42,000	$46,000	$50,600
Beaver					
Box Elder		9,000	20,000	11,500	12,650
Cache				7,000	10,000
Carbon			5,000		
Daggett	NUES*				
Davis		24,000	30,000	35,000	38,500
Duchesne	NUES*		4,000	6,500	7,150
Emery					5,500
Garfield					
Grand			5,000	7,500	8,250
Granite	48,000	57,150	53,000	55,000	60,500
Iron				2,000	
Jordan		42,500	55,000	60,000	66,000
Juab					2,564
Kane		2,500	2,500	2,500	
Millard		5,000	4,000	7,000	7,700
Morgan		10,000	10,000	8,000	8,000
Nebo		5,000	3,000	3,000	5,864
North Sanpete					2,564
North Summit	NUES*				
Park City	NUES*				5,000
Piute		5,000	3,000	3,000	
Rich	NUES*				
San Juan					2,564
Sevier			7,000	9,000	9,900
South Sanpete					2,000
South Summit	NUES*				
Tintic	NUES*				
Tooele	6,000	9,000	20,000	18,000	19,800
Uintah	10,000	8,000	12,000	14,000	15,400
Wasatch	NUES*	10,000	11,000	9,000	9.900
Washington				7,000	10,000
Wayne					
Weber	$7,000	$15,000	$23,500	$30,000	$33,000
Salt Lake	35,000	38,500	53,500	39,100	43,000
Ogden		10,000	31,000	31,000	40,000
Provo	15,000	15,000	30,000	38,000	41,800
Logan			31,000	28,000	28,600
Murray			5,000	7,000	
School for the Deaf				5,000	5,500
NUES* (Northeaster Utah Education Services)	16,000	18,000	20,000	19,000	20,900
TOTALS	$137,000	$317,150	$480,000	$514,600	$571,206

In the "State Plan for Educational Advancement of the Gifted and Talented Students in Utah" the definition for gifted and talented students reads:

> Children and youth capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the numerous intellectual abilities, special academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, talents in visual and performing arts, and various psycho-motor abilities.

The state plan for the Gifted and Talented Students program proposes to identify and develop all of these multiple types of learning and thinking talents and gifts, not simply the singular, academic type of giftedness. There is a need for a wide spectrum of assessment procedures and classroom activities to develop students who function effectively, and for evaluative measures which are compatible with these different learnings.

Utah's program is capitalizing on research and technology in the areas of traditional academic talent, productive thinking, creative thinking, communication, planning, forecasting, decision-making, and leadership talents. In addition, there is emphasis on other talents such as visual arts and performing arts. An extension of these, plus other classifications of human potential, will always be considered as possible program enphases. The projects selected for 1980-81 represent a variety of approaches.

The Utah Statewide Educational Assessment Study, conducted in 1975 by the Utah State Office of Education, assists in providing measurement of student performance and qualities in a variety of areas relevant to the identification of the gifted. This study, while accomplishing

evaluation of basic academic areas goes beyond the traditional academic areas with identification of measures related to the state education goals, such as Productive Maturity, Emotional Maturity, Aesthetic Maturity, and Social Maturity.

II. Descriptive Characteristics of the Program

The wide variety of proposals funded for 1979-80 gives education leaders and evaluators the opportunity to determine features of the projects which are desirable and should be continued, or undesirable and discontinued.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION
STATE CATEGORICAL FUNDED PROJECTS
GIFTED AND TALENTED

1980-81

1.	Alpine (Continuing)	50 North Center American Fork, UT 84003 "Training for Giftedness--Students and Teachers" A special effort is being made to individualize programs for students in the secondary schools. Modules will be developed for use in training the teachers in a teacher center. Activities which teachers develop are compiled. Criteria will be developed to measure teacher effectiveness. Creativity centers have been set up in two schools. Learning modules for students will be adopted, and others developed. A learning center is to be set up at Lehi Junior High School.	Stanley Leavitt $50,600
2.	Box Elder (Continuing)	230 West 2nd South Brigham City, UT 84302 Two full day-programs have been set up (North Park and Lakeview) for fifth and sixth graders. Fifty students will be involved. Third and fourth grade enrichment in a resource center will be provided. Seventh and eighth graders have an accelerated reading program.	Louise F. Francis Richard Kimber $12,650
3.	Cache (Expansion)	2063 North 1200 East Smithfield, UT 84321 "Development of a Correlated Program for Gifted/Talented, Grades 1-12" Media Specialists will act as facilitators and will have aides to assist. Students will pursue in-depth studies of interest individually, or in small groups. A committee will be set up in the valley, and community resources will be utilized. The Humanities class will be expanded. Teachers will have continued inservice training and "Talents Unlimited" will be a base of this program.	Kenneth Webb Stephen Thurston $10,000

State Categorical Funded Projects
Gifted/Talented 1980-81

4.	Davis (Continuing)	45 East State Street Farmington, UT 84025 "Communication . . . Helping Students Discover, Develop, and Share Their Communications Talents Through Exploration, Training, And Production" Students selected will be pre-school through grade twelve. Parents will be involved in appropriate activities. This program will initiate a comprehensive program in all facets of communication inasmuch as "communication is so pervasive in human behavior and so fundamental to the development of the technological, moral, and spiritual competence of students."	Dallas Workman $38,500
5.	Duchesne (Continuing)	Box M Duchesne, UT 84021 Seventy students in grades 1 to 6 in seven elementary schools will receive special service. One teacher will be assigned from each school and a coordinator will support and strengthen techniques of these teachers. Parents will be involved in the planning. At the junior high level, an elective course in creativity will be activated. Community resources will be utilized.	Laurence W. Szaraniec $7,150
6.	Grand (Continuing)	P.O. Box 69 Moab, UT 84532 A media paraprofessional will assist the program director in the SPARK program for academically talented students of the Middle School. Tutors will be used for students with other talents. Sharing sessions are featured in teacher training.	Aleen B. Nielsen $8,250
7.	Granite (Continuing)	340 East 3545 South Salt Lake City, UT 84115 "Gifted and Talented Educational Support Systems" The following components are included in the program: a. Options for individual school programs. b. Providing supplies as needed.	Vondella Savage Darrell Allington $60,500

		c. Continued inservice. d. Encouraging other staff members to use ideas and materials. e. Talents Unlimited. f. Student modules. g. Updated professional materials. h. Community involvement.	
8.	Jordan (Continuing)	9361 South 4th East Sandy, UT 84070 "Facilitating the Development of Gifted/ Talented Students" A major survey on gifted education was conducted in the district. The current proposal reflects these needs as determined by the survey: a. A special program for academically talented. b. Selection and training of teachers. c. Communication with parents. d. A district master plan. Although the mainstream approach will be continued, a pullout program is proposed. The program is designed as a total cooperative school program. A teacher for the gifted will be identified at each grade level, and students identified as potentially gifted will study with this teacher. Curriculum will be designed to meet their needs.	JoAnn B. Seghini $66,000
9.	Millard (Expansion)	160 West Main Delta, UT 84624 Interest centers will be developed to capitalize on student interest and help discover talents. When the students have been identified in all areas of curriculum, mentors and instructors will be brought in to encourage in-depth study. Students K-12 will be concerned.	Jack Fowles $7,700
10.	Morgan (Continuing)	P.O. Box 530 Morgan, UT 84050 All of the schools are participating in an articulated program which is made possible because of the unique communciation potential. Appropriate enrichment learning experiences have been designed for elementary students. In the middle school a resource center is set up for use by cross disciplinary teams. The high school will identify one teacher from each department to work with small groups.	Jay B. Taggart $8,000

State Categorical Funded Projects
Gifted/Talented 1980-81

11.	Nebo (Springville High /continuing/) $3,300 (Barnett /new/) $2,564	350 South Main Spanish Fork, UT 84660	Darlene Arnott Thomas H. Hudson $5,864
		At Springville High, enrichment experiences will be provided to students who qualify for the program (up to 10%). Research and seminar experiences in and out of school will be set up. The IEP conference will be utilized as an identification tool. The Advisory Committee serves as liaison and assists the school in planning the program. Life work opportunities may be explored. Barnett school provides a summer stimulation experience and is geared to investigation of the potential of a year-round program. Students are selected from preschool through middle school. An advisory committee will work with the group. Emphasis will be placed on individualized learning styles.	
12.	Sevier (Continuing)	195 East 5th North Richfield, UT 84701	Richard Bell $9,900
		Pahvant School is serving as a model in inservice education and learning centers. Monroe, Koosharem, and Salina schools will be involved. Modules, as well as centers, will be developed and in one school a pull-out program will be provided. The community education program will work closely with the program.	
13.	Tooele (Continuing)	66 West Vine Tooele, UT 84074	Brent McBride $19,800
		The program will be extended to junior and senior high students as well as to those in the eight elementary schools. Coordinators will be appointed from each school, an educational plan will be developed, and training sessions set up. The aim is to make the district program self-sufficient.	
14.	Uintah	635 West 200 South Vernal, UT 84078	Phillip Ellis Wally Goddard $15,400
		Principals will be in charge of directing the programs in their schools with the district coordinator assisting in the individual programs which offer maximum benefit to the gifted students in the various schools. A	

		number of programs have been introduced for consideration, and inservice will be provided. Sharing is an important feature of this program and many activities will be designed for this purpose.	
15.	Wasatch (Continuing)	200 East 800 South Heber City, UT 84032 All schools are involved in the program and there is close cooperation with the Northeastern Utah Educational Center. "Talents Unlimited" is capitalized on. A variety of programs designed to fit the needs of the specific school will be promoted.	Bill Dudley $9,900
16.	Washington (Expansion)	189 West Tabernacle St. George, UT 84770 Individual schools submitted proposals, including three elementary and Dixie Junior High. The district distributed funds to each according to their program needs. A community education intern will coordinate a Community Talent Bank to assist the schools in matching student interests and needs with identified volunteers. An AP program will be initiated this year.	Stanley Plewe $10,000
17.	Weber (Expansion)	1122 Washington Blvd. Ogden, UT 84402 In developing policies, procedures, curriculum, and strategies, past experience will be utilized. A staff training model and individual programs resulting in student learning outcomes will be developed. Ongoing programs will continue.	Douglas Mann Betty Nowak $33,000
18.	Salt Lake City (Expansion)	440 East 1st South Salt Lake City, UT 84111 The Horizons program provides differentiated learning experiences for identified children K-8. In-depth study is featured on a pull-out basis. In addition to academic enrichment, experience is provided in cultural awareness, self-awareness, and self-expression. A full-time teacher will be in each of 20 schools, a half-time teacher in seven, and in the six intermediate schools.	Margaret Richards $43,000

State Categorical Funded Projects
Gifted/Talented 1980-81

19.	Provo (Expansion)	280 West 940 North Provo, UT 84601	James Bergera $41,800

Each of the eight participating schools has a school coordinator and a school committee, and the program will expand to the remaining three schools. The total district project will be coordinated by a specialist in gifted education and the Coordinator of Elementary Education. A university intern will be hired to assist with inservice and to work with individual teachers. Sharing sessions will be held monthly.

20.	Logan (Expansion)	101 West Center Logan, UT 84321	Gary L. Carlston $6,600

In addition to the Adams and Woodruff schools, Hillcrest, Wilson, and Ellis will receive "Talents Unlimited" training. The junior and senior high school staffs will also have in-service training. Computers will be used at Logan Junior High. Community resources such as the Alliance for the Varied Arts will be utilized.

21.	Ogden	2444 Adams Avenue Ogden, UT 84401	Gerald Raat $40,000

SEAGULL (Expansion) $7,000	Phyllis Shaw
NEW School (Continuing) $22,000	Barry Gomberg
Wasatch Resource (Expansion) $2,000	Mary Kirschner
Wasatch Elementary (new) $3,000	Helen Dabling
Intern (new) $4,000	Monte Ogden
Hillcrest (new) $2,000	Judee Stanley

A. SEAGULL

Supplying Enrichment and Guidance, Unusual Learning Labs. A project to develop enrichment learning experiences appropriate for youngsters who have been identified as gifted and talented.

ARTISANS. Artists Residing, Teaching, Inspiring, Sharing, and Nurturing Gifted Students. A supplemental project to be merged with SEAGULL.

Fifth and sixth grade students participate in a pullout program one day a week in the Horace Mann Media Center.

B. NEW School. Nonconformists Entitled to Wisdom is an educational alternative for underachieving dropout students who participate in an individualized program. Features of the program include group meetings, thematic units, independent study, life sports, group retreats, cross-age tutoring.

C. WASATCH Resource. Project Assist. (Assisting Social Studies in Stimulating Talent.) Workshops will be conducted for teachers in a center supplied with materials and resources for use by students and teachers.

D. WASATCH School. A social studies educational design to provide opportunities for the gifted student to develop necessary skills to understand and find solutions to social problems now and in the future. A strong, active, parent teacher organization supports the program. The project will be closel allied with the state social studies curriculum.

E. INTERN Project. Selected Ben Lomond students will intern with county commission and city department heads and courts. Community resources will be capitalized on to enrich classroom learning.

F. HILLCREST. Encouragement of talents and creative thinking skills for first, second, and third grade students. Activities will include puppetry, pottery, photography, music, drama, astronomy, weaving, dance, and architecture.

22. Northeastern Utah Education Center (Continuing)

755 South Main
Heber City, UT 84032

E. Kent Ellertson
$20,900

Rural schools project for gifted and talented serves Daggett, Duchesne, Morgan, North Summit, Park City, Rich, South Summit, Uintah, and Wasatch. The primary functions include identifying students, research, and inservice training.

"Talents Unlimited" programs will be promoted, a part-time director will assist with inservice. Educators will be sent to appropriate workshops.

23. Edith Bowen Laboratory School (Continuing)

Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322

Barbara Howell
$22,000

"A Gifted/Talented Program for Elementary Children with Impact on Preservice Teacher Education and Materials for Dissemination"

		Provision is made for university students to observe and participate in teaching these students, as well as providing a demonstration model by other schools. Workshops, reading materials, and information will be available to Cache, Logan, and Box Elder Districts, and to other districts upon request.	
24.	School for the Deaf	846 20th Street Ogden, UT 84401 "Special Education for the Gifted Hearing Impaired" In addition to providing services for these students, our goal is to develop a model program for other schools to put into effect. The program will be limited to Ogden City schools and will capitalize on local community and college resources.	Sue Carver $5,500
25.	Emery (Book Cliff /new/)	Green River, UT 84528 Emphasis will be given to inservice activities with demonstrations and a program will be developed. In this rural area talents of the students, which are often neglected, will be featured and enrichment activities provided.	Blaine Evans $5,500
26.	Juab (Middle School /new/)	475 East 800 North Nephi, UT 84648 The program will instruct students in goal setting, communication, personal curriculum and self-evluation. Some inservice will be provided for teachers.	Betty Mikkelson $2,564
27.	North Sanpete (new)	41 West Main Mt. Pleasant, UT 84647 A developmental program with intention to expand to include all grades. Two schools will be identified for initiating the program. Inservice for teachers will be highlighted.	Reed K. Miller $2,564
28.	Park City (new)	445 Marsac Avenue Park City, UT 84060 "Profiles of American System" One objective will be to create a living resource library. Emphasis is on the middle school	Otis Falls $5,000

		where the program will give in-depth experience in the community through study of Mass Media, Real Estate, Science, Marketing, Finance, and Performing Arts.	
29.	San Juan	207 North 1st East Monticello, UT 84535	Bert Odette
		One teacher at Monticello High School will provide enrichment activities for gifted students. Community resources will be identified and used to enrich the program.	

III. Program Evaluation

Certain observations have come to light in the three years in which special funding has been available for Gifted and Talented Student projects in the state. While more definitive information must still await a longer period of experience with the program, the observations below, gleaned from project reports and interviews with project personnel, seem worthy of noting:

1. Students involved in the program have experienced a differentiated curriculum which has freed them to explore, inquire, and create by utilizing higher cognitive concepts and processes. Students are seeing the value of independent learning and are better motivated to learn. "Students have learned self-motivation, career orientation, problem solving, and skill development.
2. Significant cognitive and noncognitive gains have been noted for students in specific gifted and talented programs.
3. Teachers have begun learning and utilizing instructional strategies which accommodate learning and thinking styles of gifted/talented students. Teachers are requesting a different type of preservice and inservice education featuring some learnings in productive thinking and interaction strategies.
4. Administrative procedures have become more flexible to accommodate special grouping arrangements for the program. Many administrators have become strong advocates of multiple talent teaching and learning.
5. Psychologists and teachers have begun to use a variety of

techniques in identifying students' unique capabilities. As new identification instruments are developed, educators are learning more significant information about students.

6. Researchers have begun developing techniques of evaluation to determine program effectiveness. Methods of evaluation beyond the objective paper and pencil test are now being used.
7. The learnings from these various projects are being capitalized on to make personalization of instruction possible for gifted and talented students in the regular school curriculum.
8. Parents are becoming more aware of children's needs and more involved in their learning. Community patrons are becoming interested in school activities as students move into the community to learn.
9. Teacher educators are becoming more aware of the special traits and characteristics needed for teaching gifted/talented students. Some teacher education institutions are offering courses and other services. One institution has become a cosponsor and promotor of gifted education.
10. A variety of people are learning to work as teams to provide more enriching learning experiences for students.
11. Schools and districts are finding funding to begin gifted and talented programs in their budgets.
12. "Human Potential" thinking is gradually gaining ground over the problem oriented (diagnostic prescriptive) negative thinking. Emphasis on strengths of students is being featured.

13. Community mentors in gifted programs are becoming part of school activities.
14. Teachers and administrators report positive reactions to the training they have received for implementing gifted programs. Districts are sharing materials, services, and personnel.
15. Many students have begun to realize that they can make better use of their creative talents and thinking powers with appropriate motivation.
16. A parent organization (UPAGT) is assisting in many activities concerned with gifted education.
17. The state-sponsored workshops have initiated inservice activities in many districts, and have created a need for higher education to be involved in the movement.
18. Student-teacher relationships have improved.
19. Districts which began with a single gifted program school are now expanding the project to other schools.
20. Creative arts provide motivation, necessitate new learning modes, elicit community interest, and create aesthetic awareness.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

The categorical funding for gifted students has not only provided enriched learning experiences for pupils in the projects, but has also caused educators to seek out new techniques concerned with identification, teaching strategies, and evaluation, thus tending to upgrade education generally. The movement has created considerable community interest in education and many people are becoming involved in the gifted programs.

Among the recommendations for the program are these:

1. It is extremely important that the State Consultant and others on the state staff keep current with the findings in the field; therefore, some monetary provision should be made for participation in national workshops.
2. Educators need updating and current information in the field; therefore, funding should be provided for inservice education through state and regional workshops.
3. Educators involved in these programs feel that provision should be made for a different kind of preservice education which would prepare teachers to cope with productive thinking, multiple talent learning, and group interaction strategies.

General conclusions include:

1. The experience provided significant learning for all involved.
2. A desire to continue and to expand programs was apparent. Many single school programs became the basis for a district program.
3. A wide variety of experiences in these exemplary projects provided a basis for sharing learning with other programs, and tended to upgrade the school experience.
4. Educators are learning more about personalizing learning as a result of the workshops and their inservice experiences.
5. Parents and community people are giving more attention to the education of their children.
6. Project directors are requesting that the funding be continued although many districts are now supplementing this funding

with district funds.

7. Several districts are holding inservice gifted workshops for all teachers in their institutes at the opening of school, or at their midwinter institutes.

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA CENTERS PROGRAM

Curriculum Division
Dr. LeRoy Lindeman, Administrator
Kenneth L. Neal, Specialist

I. General Program Information

The appropriation of categorical funds for instructional media is for the purpose of improving the quality of services rendered by the media centers in the public schools of Utah. The allocation of these funds is made on the premise that the individual school has a functional media center and that the State Office of Education's guidelines were being followed by the media staff of each school. The funds are allocated on a formula basis. The decision as to whether or not the school has a functional media center is made on the basis of participation in the Integrated Media Program. The funds are then divided according to the number of functional centers and the number of students in the school.

The guidelines used to ensure that the Integrated Media Program is being followed are:

1. Identify specific district staff to administer the program.
2. Provide for the evaluation of the program.
3. Meet district priorities and specifically identified needs.
4. Be based on specific long-range goals and objectives.
5. Permit the district to:
   a. Enrich all parts of the curriculum.
   b. Provide learning experiences for all students.

c. Assist in developing reading, viewing, and listening abilities and tastes.

d. Acquire varied teaching and learning options to meet needs and interests of students of varying levels of maturity and ability.

e. Equip media centers for independent student research.

f. Provide more complete resources for teachers in locating and presenting information.

g. Assist teachers in becoming more proficient in their methods and techniques of teaching.

The guidelines further provided that funds for the program be spent only for acquisition of personnel, materials, equipment, or supplies, and that use of local funds not be supplanted in such acquisitions, but supplemented. It was also required that purchased equipment and materials be specifically inventoried and clearly marked.

Each school electing to participate in the Integrated Media Program was required to assess their present status in philosophy, personnel, facilities, equipment, and materials according to the Utah State Office of Education's media guidelines. The school then developed a five year plan for future growth and divided this into one year achievable objectives. Forms illustrating the present status, one year objectives, and five year goals were submitted by each school and are on file in the State Media Utilization Specialist's Office.

II. Descriptive Characteristics of the Program

The expenditures for FY'79 indicate that all forty of Utah's school districts participated in the use of these funds. All forty also participated in the Integrated Media Program.

There were 324,905 students in Utah's schools at the beginning of the 1979-80 school year. Experience and surveys taken in preparation of accreditation visits indicate that approximately eighty percent of our students, use the school media centers.

All elementary, middle, junior high, and senior high schools in the State of Utah participated in this program.

III. Program Evaluation

The data obtained from each school's five year plan for future growth forms mentioned above was placed into the computer and a statistical evaluation was obtained as a result. This evaluation covers every school and district in the state. A state average was also computated. Each school and district can be compared with each other and with itself. The data pertaining to each district and its schools, was forwarded to the respective superintendent for his use. It has been found that such data was frequently used in the local district and school level to effect improvements.

The implications of this program for each local agency were as follows:

1. To provide a media support system for the instructional program in the elementary and secondary schools of Utah that will:
   a. Provide teachers and students with available resources for research and study.
   b. Provide teachers and students with available facilities for producing their own materials needed for instructional and reporting purposes.
   c. Provide resources which will encourage meeting the needs

of each student, emphasizing an individualized approach to learning.

d. Develop reading, viewing and listening skills.

e. Assist teachers in becoming more proficient in their methods and techniques of teaching.

2. To provide the districts with an improved management system for the media program that will:

a. Assist them in defining short-term and long-range objectives.

b. Assist them in developing a plan for meeting those objectives.

c. Provide a method whereby the schools and districts can annually review and evaluate their progress in reaching the established annual objectives of the program.

3. To integrate the media system into the total instructional program so that it becomes an integral part of the learning process and not an adjunct to nor an appendage on the side.

Reports from district personnel cited several contributions that implementation of the Media Centers Program have made to school improvement. The most frequently mentioned improvements made possible by the use of these funds were:

1. Increased inventory of equipment, materials, and supplies.
2. Increased integration of media with instruction and more cooperation between teachers and media coordinators.
3. Increased ability to hire additional media personnel, especially aides.

4. Increased centralization and organization of centers and materials with acquisition of personnel.
5. Increased stimulation of more school-wide needs assessment, goal-setting, and curriculum planning to more nearly meet state standards.
6. Increased stimulation to establish a regular media budget using local funds.
7. Increased ability to extend library and/or media center hours.
8. Increased ability to provide instruction to students and teachers in use of the media center.
9. Increased improvement in the availability of resources to facilitate individualization of instruction.

Our major problem areas in the Instructional Media Program lie in:

1. The lack of professionally trained and certified media coordinators in our schools.
2. The inability of those schools where a professional media coordinator is not available to teach basic life-long media skills. It is estimated that 60% of students leaving the elementary schools in this state have not been taught sufficient skills in research, production, reference, and other such areas to know how to obtain information in the secondary school media centers. Many of our elementary schools have untrained aides who work hard but lack the background to teach such critical skills which will be needed long after actual subject matter is forgotten.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Funding and Accountibility are shown in the attached tables of FY'79 expenditures and FY'80 allocations. (See Table 1 and Table 2)

The impetus given by having these as categorical funds has resulted in strong leadership emerging on the state and local district level. A vast improvement has been seen in the Integrated Media Program over the ten or more years this program has been in operation. Continuous study shows considerable change in the number of learning options available to teachers and students as well as improved self-images and motivation. These benefits have occurred because this program has encouraged planning, assessment, and evaluation and has provided personnel and additional materials in many schools which facilitate the learning process. These positive actions have greatly enhanced the learning-teaching options for students and teachers. This would probably not be the case if the funds were no longer identified for use as an option in the special-purpose program area.

Program leaders in the State School Office also believe that nearly all of the non-professional staff in districts would be lost over a period of two or three years if this were not retained as a categorical fund. In addition, it is believed that many of the professional media coordinators would be discontinued as changes came about through retirement, transfers, etc., and would not be replaced in many districts if the special emphasis status were changed.

It is recommended that the Instructional Media Program continue as a categorically funded program and that the program management remain under the jurisdiction of the school districts and carried out in accordance with the State Office of Education's guidelines.

TABLE 1

Utah State Office of Education
Division of Education Support Services

SPECIAL PURPOSE OPTIONAL PROGRAMS

12-1-79

EXPENDITURES FY'79 (Pre-final)

No.	District	Instructional Media	Extended Year, Day and Summer	Compensatory Education	Elementary School Guidance	Community Education	Career Education	Total Expenditures	Total Anticipation Allocation (All Programs)
01	Alpine	$ 263,876	$ 119,316	$ -	$ 61,952	$ 55,529	$ 20,191	$ 520,864	$ 281,803
02	Beaver	4,652	750	-	2,062	1,812	1,791	11,067	17,253
03	Box Elder	33,615	26,781	-	36,502	13,961	-	110,859	107,523
04	Cache	26,359	24,296	10,047	13,479	46,454	-	120,635	87,962
05	Carbon	20,387	14,440	19,797	5,604	16,959	10,000	87,187	62,554
06	Daggett	1,339	-	-	-	4,720	-	6,059	5,872
07	Davis	69,172	147,642	62,493	159,489	238,481	31,888	709,165	421,950
08	Duchesne	10,984	21,498	-	-	28,964	3,137	64,583	49,484
09	Emery	23,997	7,422	-	-	18,942	-	50,361	37,986
10	Garfield	5,952	3,159	3,789	2,916	2,796	1,082	19,694	19,162
11	Grand	5,173	4,785	3,768	4,417	7,353	1,639	27,135	23,479
12	Granite	1,081,644	-	176,505	141,011	129,131	50,218	1,578,509	735,490
13	Iron	21,838	15,004	-	-	25,745	-	62,587	53,018
14	Jordan	67,956	116,016	87,424	90,267	193,345	28,848	583,856	490,405
15	Juab	6,233	7,746	-	-	2,529	1,000	17,508	16,049
16	Kane	20,432	7,246	-	-	4,937	2,971	35,586	16,922
17	Millard	14,618	10,556	-	5,285	5,706	1,961	38,126	34,300
18	Morgan	4,197	8,786	-	650	2,984	1,350	17,967	16,631
19	Nebo	25,984	43,586	36,383	28,163	55,497	8,324	197,937	151,009
20	No. Sanpete	8,120	7,491	-	1,775	9,403	-	26,789	25,768
21	No. Summit	8,763	1,000	-	-	-	-	9,763	9,763
22	Park City	3,401	2,033	-	4,247	4,430	-	14,111	11,225
23	Piute	3,071	1,629	2,653	1,267	1,215	470	10,305	10,159
24	Rich	9,305	-	-	-	-	-	9,305	9,294
25	San Juan	9,413	81,359	46,709	6,020	17,951	-	161,452	82,343
26	Sevier	20,245	9,553	7,232	-	5,333	14,872	57,235	57,485
27	So. Sanpete	11,664	22,717	-	6,903	-	-	41,284	27,997
28	So. Summit	3,124	5,203	-	-	5,391	-	13,718	11,783
29	Tintic	2,851	4,018	-	3,244	1,689	-	11,802	9,171
30	Tooele	18,406	37,944	17,329	19,554	15,782	-	109,015	88,564
31	Uintah	11,038	16,808	31,136	11,582	11,105	13,924	95,593	63,463
32	Wasatch	3,387	2,300	6,578	-	11,600	-	23,865	26,930
33	Washington	30,875	15,139	13,473	-	14,667	-	74,154	73,908
34	Wayne	1,729	4,836	1,579	1,639	2,771	608	13,162	10,373
35	Weber	37,[illegible]	55,603	22,71[illegible]	40,679	59,598	17,453	233,886	233,192
36	Salt Lake	45,809	85,406	29[illegible],242	27,300	-	20,120	476,877	387,602
37	Ogden	[illegible],259	53,319	75,695	16,066	64,182	9,516	246,037	201,265
38	Provo	41,278	41,164	9,730	38,803	-	14,816	145,791	126,359
39	Logan	22,677	22,671	-	4,000	14,819	65,731	129,898	46,945
40	Murray	30,522	24,710	-	15,450	117,024	-	187,706	64,699
	TOTALS	$2,059,182	$1,073,932	$933,278	$750,326	$1,212,805	$321,910	$6,351,433	$4,207,140

TABLE 2

79-80 Budget

Alpine	47,225		
Beaver	5,120		
Box Elder	22,652		
Cache	16,664		
Carbon	11,736		
Daggett	2,997		
Davis	74,716		
Duchesne	11,001		
Emery			
Garfield	6,005		
Grand	5,555		
Granite	112,931		
Iron	10,325		
Jordan	79,351		
Juab	3,680		
Kane	4,762		
Millard	6,617		
Morgan	4,513		
Nebo	28,264		
North Sanpete	6,591		
North Summit			
Park City	3,761		
Piute	3,343		
Rich	3,871		
San Juan	10,081		
Sevier	10,312		
South Sanpete	6,618		
South Summit	3,317		
Tintic	3,257		
Tooele	15,969		
Uintah	11,490		
Wasatch	6,235		
Washington	13,599		
Wayne	3,498		
Weber	43,883		
Salt Lake City	49,093		
Ogden	27,892		
Provo	20,053		
Logan	9,501		
Murray	12,578		
	719,056		

RESPONSIBLE PARENTHOOD PROGRAMS

Fiscal Year 1980
Special Projects Administration
Dr. Don K. Richards, Administrator
Mr. Morris G. Rowley, Project Director

Fiscal Year 1981
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
Dr. LeRoy R. Lindeman, Administrator
Dorothy Wardrop, Coordinator

I. General Program Information

The Legislature has provided funds to implement pilot projects in responsible parenthood each year since 1977. The first appropriation was $233,600, and a cost-of-living adjustment has been provided in each subsequent year. The 1980 Legislature appropriated $279,360.

Each year the resulting projects have been funded under competitive proposal procedures based on guidelines developed by the Utah State Office of Education staff. Criteria for selection of the projects have been based on these standards and guidelines. Funded projects fall into three general categories:

1. High school course curricula.
2. K-12 programs. Courses where skills considered to be basic to parenting are infused into all subjects of the regular program at all grade levels.
3. Adult education programs. These take the form of evening

classes for parents; day classes for mothers; and resource materials, including toys and other items, for parents to use at home with their children.

In all, some fifteen projects have been funded. This year most projects have designed dissemination kits and procedures which will be available to all districts in the state. Most show considerable promise.

II. Descriptive Characteristics of the Program

This year, fifteen projects were funded by responsible parenthood money and approximately nine Parent Education Resource Centers (PERC) were funded with other monies. Each of the fifteen projects is distinctive in its own right. In Jordan School District, for example, the staff has attempted to spell out fundamental concepts and skills needed for responsible parenthood/adulthood and to adjust the curriculum so that these skills and concepts are taught every year at the level of maturity of the student. This is an extremely comprehensive program and holds real promise for impacting on future parents. In contrast to this, the Sky View High School in Cache District has developed an elective course for juniors. This course presents materials with the assumption that students are fully aware of their need for information and training in dealing with specific problems and experiencing activities related to the family, its development, and management. The course is very popular, and its proponents claim great success. Other programs are located at the junior high school level where the approach is to assist students in acquiring the general skills which they will need later as parents.

In the larger school districts, a sophisticated effort has been made to develop curriculum outlines, topics, and materials for high-

quality curricula. These materials have been developed not only for the districts themselves but are available for use throughout the state.

The projects as a group represent materials, strategies, and a wide variety of models which can be adopted or adapted at kindergarten through twelfth-grade levels as well as in adult education. These materials and models will fulfill a very important need in the state.

Since 1971, the PTA has repeatedly called to the attention of school officials the fact that the family is in jeopardy. They cite statistics on divorce rate, teenage pregnancy, child abuse and neglect, general delinquincy, and other phenomena as evidence that much needs to be done in the education system which will ultimately result in strengthening families. The target, therefore, is identifying and meeting the needs of all students at their particular level of maturity.

One of the recent and most significant developments has been the production of a resource file. This document is a record of individual teacher experiences in the infusion of fundamental parenting skills into the regularly assigned programs for which they are responsible. Twenty teachers were selected. Their assignments ranged from kindergarten through twelfth grade. Most of the secondary school disciplines were represented. A series of Saturday workshops were conducted in which the following skill clusters were discussed and strategies for providing practice opportunities for students were considered:

1. Skill in thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making.
2. Skill in positive interpersonal relationships.
3. Skill in use of freedom and responsibility.

4. Skill in receiving and expressing love.
5. skill in leadership and followership.
6. Skill in personal and family economics.
7. Skill in responding to natural growth and development.
8. Skill in communication.

Teachers were asked to go back to their classes and attempt to provide students such opportunities.

The following principles were emphasized in the workshop:

1. Skills are mind muscle operations which become refined and automatic through intelligent practice with appropriate coaching.
2. The closer the skill to be learned is to the student's personal interest, purpose, or personal need, the more commitment there will be and the more intense the practice and the learning will be.
3. People can verbalize concepts about skills personally without acquiring them; therefore, purposeful practice with coaching is essential.
4. While these skills represent accepted fundamental outcomes of education, they must not be assumed to have been learned simply because students have been exposed to course content. If they are not deliberately taught (through continued spirals of repeated practice), they will be learned at a very low level if at all.

As teachers returned from a week's work with students, they shared with each other their enthusiasm, disappointments, strategies, successes, frustrations, and gave and received suggestions for modification. They

returned to their schools with new ideas and with the reinforcement received from each other and from the project director. This process was repeated five times, and the final product recorded. Each teacher prepared three to five brief summaries of their personal experiences. This record has been prepared for publication and for use by other teachers in the state.

III. Program Evaluation

Among other things learned is that courses as such are perhaps the weakest link in the effort. The activities which have real value are those which provide experience in the skills that qualify people to become competent adults. Examples of these skills are thinking, problem-solving, decision-making, positive interpersonal relationships, use of freedom with responsibility, leadership and followership, and communication.

It is widely accepted that the best situation in which people learn to be good parents is in the home where good parents provide leadership for the family. Our other area of greatest value is that of strengthening practicing parents by providing teaching materials and other resources so they may become more competent, satisfactory, and satisfied parents as they raise their own children. By following this route, it is possible that many families will be sufficiently strengthened that their children will become strong parents as a product.

Implications for local education agencies are quite clear. Schools will receive maximum benefit by working to infuse the skills of parenting into all areas of the curriculum, strengthening those courses where parenting skills are taught, and encouraging implementation of adult

education activities which make possible the improvement of parenting skills among those parents who have children at home.

The achievements which can be pointed to most readily are the curricula which have been developed and the model programs now available to other school districts for their adoption or adaptation. Three problems still remain:

1. How to make sure that the projects continue after state funds are withdrawn.
2. How to infuse fundamental skills into all aspects of the curriculum.
3. How to make sure that districts are not just meeting graduation requirements without producing programs that really impact on the lives and behaviors of students.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

This year a series of Parent Education Resource Centers have again been funded. It is hoped that these centers will form a network from which other satellite centers will develop so that service to adults can be available in all areas of the state. It is, therefore, recommended that this network be completed and strengthened so that it serves its intended purpose.

The staff of the Utah State Office of Education will be available as these projects are developing to provide consultant service and to help in any way possible to make sure that quality is achieved. Accountability efforts should become more rigorous without imposing bureaucratic dictatorship on local districts. This can be achieved by more intensive but helpful monitoring activities.

It can be safely said that the demand for responsible parenthood programs has reached the point where the public is pushing the education system rather than the reverse. With appropriate attention and leadership from the Utah State Office of Education, responsible parenthood can become a functioning part of the institution and remain to make a significant contribution in the years ahead.